

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1409582



The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

6559
C3
1878

COLLECTED WRITINGS

OF THE LATE

THOMAS CARLYLE, Esq.,

OF THE SCOTTISH BAR.

LONDON:

THOMAS BOSWORTH, 198, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

MDCCCLXXVIII.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

LONDON: W. J. JOHNSON, PRINTER, 121, FLEET STREET.

P R E F A C E.

IT has appeared to some of the friends of the late MR. THOMAS CARLYLE, of the Scottish Bar, that the several short writings published by him between the years 1845 and 1854 (all of which have run out of print), possess more than a passing interest, and that the sound religious and political principles set forth in them are such as to make it desirable to gather up these works into one, and issue them in a convenient and enduring form.

The present Volume is therefore sent forth, in the belief that it will form a valuable addition to many libraries, on account of its intrinsic worth, and may afford a welcome guidance to many a thinking man in these last days, when the principles of our most holy Faith are being stealthily undermined, and even openly attacked.

November, 1877.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
THE MORAL PHENOMENA OF GERMANY (1845) . . .	13
ON THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY BAPTISM (1850) . . .	149
THE ONE CATHOLIC SUPREMACY (1851) . . .	169
THE DOOR OF HOPE FOR BRITAIN (1853) . . .	189
THE DOOR OF HOPE FOR CHRISTENDOM (1853) . . .	212
APOSTLES GIVEN, LOST, AND RESTORED (1853) . . .	273
ON THE OFFICE OF THE PARACLETE IN THE PRAYERS OF THE CHURCH (1853)	329
ON SYMBOLS IN WORSHIP (1853).	341
ON THE EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES (1854) . . .	361
WARNING FOR THE UNWARY AGAINST SPIRITUAL EVIL (1854)	405
SHALL TURKEY LIVE OR DIE? (1854).	419
PLEADINGS WITH MY MOTHER: THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND (1854)	437

THE
MORAL PHENOMENA OF GERMANY.

Second Edition—Enlarged.

1845.

NOTE ON CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

“THE works by which our blessed Lord became the Head of the Church are peculiar to Himself, and delegated to none ; but those which He performs as Head of the Church are not only capable of delegation, but intended to be delegated. That His functions are capable of delegation is proved by their having been devolved on some. These functions are priestly, because He is a priest ; and they are permanently delegated, because He and the work to be done in His Church abide the same. He alone became incarnate, and suffered vicarious death ; but He has delegated to His servants to present the memorial of His death, which He pleads in heaven. He alone opened the way to the Father ; but He delegates to His servants to approach not merely to Him, but to the Father through Him. He alone took away sins ; but having, as Son of Man, received power to bind and to loose, He delegates that power to His servants. If such delegation conflicts with the truth of His sole mediatorship, the delegation of preaching does so no less. If none may absolve but Christ in person, none may preach but He in person. The authority given by Him to bind and loose was as explicit, and is as enduring, as the commission to preach. If the one was given to men, so was the other. If the one is now pleaded as a warrant, so may the other. Yet His priestly functions, though *delegated*, are not *transferred*. His priesthood is not less, and cannot be more, than His ministers’, towards God and man. They have no authority or office of their own.”

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	7
II. GOVERNMENT	13
III. NOBILITY	20
IV. SOCIETY	27
V. THE LEARNED	39
VI. THE CHURCH	57
VII. CONCLUSION	117

INTRODUCTION.

“ Εξ ἐμπειρίας ὄμμα.”

THE moral phenomena of any country are the things which appear to influence its ethical condition, and evince its religious principles. In shortly sketching those of Germany, I shall not add another to the many descriptions of things which lie on the mere surface of society ; I shall not imitate those who seek to give interest to their remarks by betraying the confidence of those among whom they have been ; nor shall I minister to the morbid tastes of the cosmopolite, falsely so called, to whom patriotism is a weakness, and home a weariness. My object is to meet the desires of those who, while owning both a country and a home, can duly appreciate, and would rightly use, what is to be found in the rest of Christendom, and to whom the institutions, manners, and literature of a country are interesting, chiefly as exponents of its moral state. Between those who, enslaved by habit, regard everything to which they are unaccustomed as bad, and those who recklessly grasp at everything new as good, a middle course should be steered, in which, neither prejudiced against the excellencies nor enamoured of the defects of foreign countries, we may justly estimate each nation on principles large enough to embrace all.

In many things the German and British characters differ. In some things, the one has the advantage—in some, the other. While neither bristly, cautious, and saturnine, like the Scotchman—nor frigid, insolent, and self-contained, like the Englishman—the German lacks the pushing perseverance of the former, and the unsentimental energy of the latter. Yet, after all, the German and the Briton bear abundant marks of near relationship ; and, with the subsidence of the Gallic fever, their consciousness of kindred has revived. France no longer rules either the language and fashion or the destiny of Europe. The two great Saxon families now feel more than ever the pleasure and profit of mutual intercourse ; and this intercourse, injurious

if exclusive, may, if rightly improved, tend to the harmonious union of other parts of Christendom more diverse.

According to the words of Chamisso—

“ Wer gründlich weiss die Mitwelt zu verheeren
Muss unvergesslich zu der Nachwelt werden ;”

the arch-desolator of his day must live in the memory of posterity. Napoleon, of whom it has been wittily yet truly said—

“ Er bürstete die Fürstenkinder,”
Und fürstete die Burstenbinder,”

culminated as a hero, but set as an antichrist. The first French Revolution came unexpected, because men did not consider how great a matter a little fire kindleth. The superstition of the Roman, the lethargy of the Greek, the philosophy of the Protestant, had left hardly a living ember of faith in Christendom. The bars of ancient formations could not cohibit the rising volcano. The Moravian, Wesleyan, and other religious revivals, were, in spite of the piety of those among whom they arose, essentially irregular and subversive, subjective and scanty. And if they did not even foster the evil, their cure did not reach it. The introverted eye of the awakened, in bidding adieu to the world, bade adieu also to the great truth that Christianity must steer the world. The microcosm of the individual was all in all. That earth of which Jesus is the heir, and His saints are the salt, was left to its fate; and when the evil burst forth, there was no voice of witness against it, as there had been none of warning. The Church had neither the light in which to detect the features of the evil, nor the weapons with which to meet its power. Social and religious gradations, the testimonies to God's manifold wisdom, and the bulwarks of true liberty, were swept helpless away. Antichristian tyranny arose on the dead level of infidel equality; and the stretching out of its wings had filled Emmanuel's land ere men awoke from their slumber.

The incubus sat heaviest on Germany. She reaped as she had sown. But with the war of liberation, an epoch in all European history, began especially a new era, moral and political, for her. Of Germany it may be truly said, that when she did awake, she awoke to righteousness. Perhaps there never was a war which so advanced the moral and religious character of a nation. Her conflict was indeed *pro aris et*

focis. The summons to arms by a king schooled in adversity went forth with a sanction truly religious, and met with a similar response from many hearts in which, till then, the seed of life had lain dormant. At that eventful time—

“When, for the public good,
Wives gave their marriage rings,
And mothers, when their sons the band of vengeance joined,
Bade them return victorious from the field,
Or with their country fall,”

the well-born youth of every province vied with the peasants as volunteers, moved by an ardour nobler than mere revenge. On the field of Leipzig, many thousand voices, emulating, in a better cause than his, the piety of Gustavus, ascribed, with Christian pæans, the victory in that battle of nations to the God who judgeth among the gods; and many a now grey-haired man can date his religious life from that era. In the spiritual, as in the natural world, pleasure after pain, light after darkness, grace after judgment, were doubly sweet. National gratitude and national godliness revived: for once, men honestly asked what they could do for God.

One answer came from England—“Circulate the Bible, and evangelize the heathen.” A good answer this, were the Church, as it should be, full of faith and the Holy Ghost—a cistern entire and filled—a body of one heart and one soul—a warrior, master of himself, and asking for another world to conquer. But a very bad answer for a broken cistern—a divided house—a body palsied, prostrate, and corrupt. Such, however, as it was, the call was answered: Anglican, or rather Anglo-Evangelical, piety became the ruling fashion of those most zealous for God, and Anglican committees the mould in which the remaining disciples of Zinsendorf, Spener, and Franke were cast.

While the German pietists thus once more, under new banners, stood up against irreligion and Rationalism, Rationalism itself underwent a revival. Schleiermacher, of Berlin, stands a striking example of the power of the word of righteousness, though mingled with much alloy of heresy. Unsound on many vital points, destructive in many of his views, and leavened with ancient and modern philosophy combined, he nevertheless arose, a mighty awakener of men—commanding by his powers the minds, and by his qualities the affections, of his hearers, from the throne to the hovel—shooting his arrows into regions which the pietists would have deemed it unholy to approach, and touching relations which never excited their concern. Many whom he could

not have led farther than he did, save to lead them astray, retain and impart to this hour, in various spheres, both civil and military, clerical and secular, a measure of the blessing which they then received.

Prussia, arrested in rising to predominance amongst the German States, was the most humbled by Napoleon, yet became the most efficient in his overthrow, and reaped the greatest moral blessing and political advantage from it. Although geographically disjointed and composed of heterogeneous elements, yet, by the great accessions to her territory, the constitution of the Customs' union, the foundation of her metropolitan University, and the paternal fostering and rigid economy of the late King, Prussia has attained a no longer questionable place among the higher European Powers; and, in the absence of all German nationality on the part of Austria, constitutes the leading type for the rest of Germany, as well as a bulwark against Russia and France. With a spirit broken by adversity, and smarting under the experience of war, Frederic III. set himself, with unostentatious industry, to heal his lacerated kingdom, and cultivate the blessings of peace. He and his subjects had fallen, suffered, fought, and conquered as one. Of him Southey justly says—

“Oppressed, but not debased,
Thou hadst thy faithful people's love.”

Their mutual ties were strong and manifold, their common recollections fresh, and their intercourse like that between a parent and a family. Although the late King had his own moral inconsistencies, was grave even to sourness, was unfortunate through evil counsel in some of his later measures, and was in many things left behind by the age in its progress towards good or evil, yet his reign was undoubtedly one of those few in which the lack of incident betokens the abundance of national blessing, in which virtue is encouraged, and vice at a discount. Although he treated the Church in his dominions too much as a mere national institution, and a branch of civil government, and had about him some ecclesiastical sycophants, yet he had strong feelings as to the dignity of the clerical office, and felt his religious desires unsatisfied by the wild speculations, abstruse technicalities, unfruitful sentimentalism, and rationalising laxity prevalent around him. He saw, moreover, that the infidel principles of which Napoleon was the exponent, though smothered, still awaited their full development;

and his belief was that "a mighty one, a hero, capable of gathering them under his wing," would yet surely appear.

The present King ascended the throne matured in years and understanding—the witness of his father's course, and exempt from some of his prejudices—a man of genius and education, and, what is rarer, of integrity and piety—honourable, sincere, transparent—capable of friendship, sympathy, and condescension, yet so conscious of his place as to repress the familiar—acute to discern—versatile and zealous, perhaps to a fault, but blessed with some faithful counsellors, with a wise and pious consort.

THE MORAL PHENOMENA OF GERMANY.

GOVERNMENT.

“Regum timendorum in proprios greges,
Reges in ipsos imperium est Jovis.”—HORACE.

HE that will legislate for the times without being legislated to by them, and who will take the lead in true improvement by reliance on the gift and grace of God, without concession to misguided clamour, has the best but most difficult of all tasks before him. This the King of Prussia feels. He stands in the breach. When he ascended the throne, the Liberals, intoxicated by their nascent power, chafing under grievances, some real, more supposed, and blind to the distinction between wise reform and reckless change, mistook his liberal sentiments for Liberalism, anticipated great things from his accession, and longed to see the old school die out with the old schoolmaster. Though the King told them, in the centre of his capital, face to face, that while he cast himself for comfort and countenance on the bosom of their loyalty, he held his crown not of them, but of God, and would serve Him, and not the will of man, yet—partly misunderstanding the somewhat unguarded expressions in which out of a full heart he promised an enlightened policy, and partly misusing the latitude which he gave to temperate discussion as an experiment on the tempers of men—they regarded their objects as already attained, triumphed in Prussia as the future head of constitutional governments, and overwhelmed its monarch with praises too vociferous to last, with encomiums which those who knew their impure source could only deprecate, and those who knew the King could only regard as grossly misapplied. Not many months after this enthusiastic jubilation, the movement party began to find that he was not their man. The pill which they had gulped soon tasted

bitter. They dreaded the influence of pietists; they suspected the King of being one. In answer to their representations he assured them that he never could grant, and no power should extort from him, that which his experience convinced him would do them evil. When their abuse of his concessions forced him to halt, and in some things to retrace his steps, they muttered their dissatisfaction. The rein became doubly galling when tightened again. They spoke out their disgust and disappointment in many parts of the kingdom. They even gave to it deliberate expression. And he who had been hailed as the leader, was soon branded as the hinderer of popular development and political liberty. Dahlmann has publicly declared, that "Germany seeks in vain security for her 'constitutions' as long as Prussia has no representative estates."

Nevertheless, the King, although he has disappointed groundless expectations, and may, in some things, be liable to the charge of haste and fickleness, has proceeded to perform that which he really did promise. In Germany, unlimited monarchy has never obtained. The German estates have always existed, to help or to withstand the monarch, and are, in fact, the germ of the English Parliament. But until after the fall of Napoleon they were mere provincial assemblies, without general jurisdiction or legislative powers. After that event, France led the way, and most of the German States followed, in endeavouring to imitate the political institutions of England. These have been, strangely enough, quoted by Conservatives and Destructives alike in support of their opposite views. Now, alas! the main distinction of our Conservative is, not that he holds sounder principles than others, but that he takes down, brick by brick, the edifice which they would at once overthrow. And since agitation has boasted such great things among us, we are oftenest quoted by Destructives. Witness the splendid stanza of Freiligrath (were his cause a better one) :—

"Meerüber ruft Britannia
Der Schwester Deutschland zu;
Wach auf, O Allemannia!
Brich deine Ketten du."

"Athwart the main Britannia cries,
Thou sister Germany, arise!
Wake up, O Alemannia! wake,
And for thyself thy fetters break."

They forgot, however, that our free institutions were the

historical result of our nation's existence—indigenous in its soil—the true exponents of its spirit; while the fac-similes taken from them were things not moulded by the nation, but intended to mould the nation; demanded, it may be, by some, but not homogeneous with the condition of the mass—plants wholly exotic. Oelrich has well said, that the problem of combining a “constitution” with a military monarchy is as difficult as the quadrature of the circle.

The late King of Prussia, in part carried by the stream, had remodelled his civic institutions; but had wisely, whether candidly or not, held back from fulfilling his supposed pledge regarding the national institutions of his kingdom. In the other German States, privileges, innocuous or wholesome if long possessed, became, when thus suddenly acquired, most injurious. The petty Parliaments of Germany, although not ruled, like that of France, by lawyers and newspaper editors, became the arena of turbulent and infidel spirits—the entrance for those principles which, like a wedge, shall rive in sunder, throughout all Europe, the bands of God, ere the bands of Satan bind it. Through these mimic Parliaments, as channels, the stream of destruction, moderated in England by the free utterance of public opinion or private complaint, now rushes forth with a violence proportioned to the undue resistance of its course. And as in America a man's loyalty and patriotism are commended by the name “*Revolutionist*”—hateful to the classical and loyal English ear—so in Germany, “*Constitutional principles*,” which England regards as her glory and bulwark, express everything subversive of monarchy and good order, and associated with infidel illumination. The present King, though determined to adhere to his father's policy notwithstanding such evils, has, in the first place, enlarged the powers and functions of the provincial estates in regard to matters provincial; and has, in the second place, empowered them to appoint a committee of the whole as a central assembly, to be summoned by him for his aid in the government of the nation. This assembly is invested with two great powers—the one, to address the King on matters desired as benefits, or felt as grievances, by the nation; the other, to deliberate and report upon matters submitted to them by him, either of his own motion, or in the settlement of such questions, arising in one or more of the provincial estates, as are either of difficult solution or of universal interest.

In this measure the King has not only gone to the full ex-

tent of what his subjects could really bear, but has succeeded, with one or two exceptions—such as the right of the subject to vote supplies, an hereditary council of peers, &c., &c.,—in paving the way for the practical exhibition of the true relation between a monarch and his national counsellors, with an accuracy hitherto unexampled even by the British Constitution, which so limits the regal power as almost to expunge it. In the theory of these arrangements, the king stands forth as a personal agent, the ruler and fountain of rule, whose will and act are his own, and who, though helped to legislate, is not legislated to, nor responsible to those whom he should rule. Holding of Christ direct, he rules for his people, not for himself; yet, in order to be a blessing to them, he opens his ear to their voice, whether of desire or apprehension, of approbation or complaint. Where he can do it unaided, he meets their wants and wishes; where he cannot, he uses his counsellors as ministers of wisdom and a girdle of strength. Yet in so doing he remembers that, as the responsible servant of Christ, he is not sent on his own charges, and that his heart is in his Master's hand, to fill it with counsels of wisdom, as no heart can be filled but that of a king. To an Englishman, whose king is difficult of approach, and incapable of right or wrong, this prominence of a person, this contact with a man, the throb of his living heart, the power of his living will, the sound of his living word, the touch of his living hand, in every branch of administration, is a novel experience, yet a pleasing one. Surely it is no more right in the State than in the Church, that the applicant should be so impeded in his approach, as to feel that he whom he seeks is lost in a cloud. If rulers are God's blessing or curse on a nation, it is in their personal qualities that either is to be felt. To that end they should be personally known. Granting the sacredness of a monarch's presence, the right he has both to forbid intrusion and to dictate the way of approach—granting the inexpediency of the head doing all in person, and the expediency of teaching men to reverence the sender in the sent,—still it is not right that the government of men by man should work as mere dead machinery, and that a nation should expect to be equally prosperous or miserable, whether its king be saint or reprobate, wise man or fool, father or tyrant. Such a system takes out a policy of insurance against both the blessing and the judgment of God; and, as experience has sadly proved in England (where, with all attachment to the Constitution, men have

little to the ruler), it must extinguish the chivalry of loyalty, loosen allegiance, and foster the sullenness of subject pride. We blush to be told by an English author that "effective loyalty, in the present age, is not a personal attachment, but a common interest in beneficial arrangements." And we need only contrast America, where a mercenary *esprit du corps* has taken the place of loyalty, with Prussia, where the people of the land cleave to a man and his house, to see the caricature of what we are, and the pattern of what we should be. It is God's way to rule by persons; for Christ is a man. If all power is of God, and rulers are vicegerents of Christ, monarchy (that is, not tyrannical monopoly of power, but government by one man, who knows and loves his people, whom his people know and love, and who uses the help which their diverse relations afford him) must be the truest form of rule. Government, save of oneself, is not the right of every man. The social contract is a dream, contrary to fact—a false etymology of things existing. Men come into the world subject. Rule is a fact coeval with creation. But rule, as well as obedience, must be *of faith*. He that demands the obedience of others must himself obey. The *autocrat* must be an *autocrat*. He must rule in the fear of God. If he do this, his people have control and security enough. If he do not, men may uphold a system of counterpoises; but they cannot have the blessing of rule. Precautions and checks are too often the refuges of men who have no faith that Christ is governing on high—who say in their hearts, "If we do not watch, none will. If we do not assert our rights, we are at the mercy of a man." All limitations of government are but necessary evils—the fruit of, or provisions against, the absence of the divine control—the poor substitutes for its exercise. And in general the overthrow of government has been produced by oppression that made wise men mad. Great as the guilt is of rebellion, that of the abuse of power is still greater. Evil, like good, descends. And if a people do, with the excuse of oppression or neglect, betray their unfaithfulness to Christ as Lord, by rising against His representative, he who rules amiss does, without excuse, betray greater unfaithfulness to Christ as the Shepherd, by tearing or deserting the flock which He would cherish. Yet after all, while a tyrant may rouse the vengeance of a nation, a democracy is responsible to none.

The great beauty of the Prussian Government—that which outweighs its little vexations and defects—is, that it is based on the *paternal*, and not the *selfish*, principle.

And it deserves admiration rather than ridicule—for starting from this postulate, that, as a father knows better than the tallest of his sons how to rule his house, so a governor knows better than the ablest of the governed how to govern. Yet it cannot be denied that the notion of national pupillage is sometimes carried in Germany to an extent which might excite a smile. The ruler acts for the subject where he should encourage the subject to act. And although that principle is false which relies on the selfishness of man for action, and gives government a mere veto, yet enterprise must be cramped where, instead of all being lawful which is not prohibited, all is unlawful which is not permitted. Under the petty tyranny, patronage, and mystery of bureaucracy, the independent bearing, perspicuous speech, and true development of the Christian citizen are impaired. And in so far as a system of espionage obtains, the German acquires a habit, otherwise foreign to him, of wearing a mask. The remains of sumptuary laws; the regulations enforcing the baptism of children, if the parents will not seek it; the imposition of education and of sacramental communion on all; the burdensome police regulations; and that excessive multiplication of orders which evinces at once the praiseworthy loyalty and the little vanity of those who covet them;—these are all matters of detail, on which opinion may differ, and on which there is room for error in judgment. But it is to be noted that, while the institutions of Prussia have controlled those utterances of public opinion which are with us so rampant, and in France so destructive, public opinion itself exercises a far more powerful and salutary, though unperceived influence, than a hasty observer might suppose. Absolute though the monarchy may be in form, there are few countries where government measures more consult popular feeling than in Prussia. Indeed, the sensitiveness of public functionaries is such as not unfrequently to impair their independence. Servility, whether towards a monarch or towards a nation, must debase. And where men tremble before public opinion instead of grappling with it, the manly oratory, in which Britain stands pre-eminent, cannot flourish. Although the Prussian citizen may be fined for not clearing his fruit trees of caterpillars, and forbidden to eat new potatoes in June, he is blessed with as equal justice as can be had under the boasted laws of Britain. Instead of being left to seek his own well-being at the expense of his neighbours, he is really cared for. A government where “mercy seasons justice,”

has little to fear from the "*civium ardor prava jubentium*." Yet, in the words of Novalis, "All props are too weak where men retain their affinity to the earth. Worldly powers can never keep themselves in equilibrium. That problem can only be solved by a third element, which is at once in the earth and not of the world." That is, God's grace in the Church.

The late attempt on the life of the King of Prussia has tended not a little to rekindle the national loyalty, already somewhat languescent. If anything could tend to confirm it, these noble and sincere words should do so with which he concludes his address to his subjects on the occasion:—"Looking up to my Divine Deliverer, I address myself with renewed ardour to my daily duty, of finishing what has been begun, carrying out what has been prepared, combating evil with fresh assurance of victory, and being to my people that which my calling requires, and their love deserves at my hands." Such words merit the response of the poet—

"*Hic ames dici Pater atque Princeps.*"

In the smaller German States, although the large emigrations from some indicate distress sufficient to overcome, not local attachments only, but the stronger love of Germany as a common fatherland, it is not to be denied that outward well-being has increased. Mendicity, which so obtrudes itself on public notice in many Papal lands, and which has penetrated with its troops of haggard sufferers into the remotest districts of England, is, except in one or two capitals, almost unknown. But the Government still exhibits the minuteness of the paternal, rendered vexatious by the severity of the regal. Yet it is well that the independent revenues of the Prince place him, in part, beyond the reach of political meddlers in the chambers. The late contest of the King Hanover with his subjects, be it in good faith or not, affects a great principle, namely, whether the ruler shall be a stipendiary or a free man. It were best did he combine independent fortune with revenue attached to public duty—the one the symbol of his dignity, the other of obligation. In most cases the dominions of the German prince were originally conquered by his ancestral sword, and have descended to him as his personal estate. The British throne is already regarded by many as the seat of a hireling, through the comparative insignificance of the royal domains.

NOBILITY.

“ Δεινός χαρακτηρ κ’ ἐπισημός ἐν βροτοῖς
Ἐσθλῶν γενεσθαι.”—EURIP. HEC.

ONE cannot fail to be struck with the contrast between the relative positions of nobility and people in England and in Germany. That “the learned pate ducks to the golden fool” is now an ancient truth. No less true is it that, even in supercilious England, the proudest peer finds ways and means for condescending contact with the gilded plebeian. Wealth is, though often secretly used, a universal cerate. Large possessions either preponderate in the hands of the nobility, or, if wasted, are ever and anon repaired by the well-dowered daughters of ambitious citizens. And hence there is no opportunity fairly to try the experiment, whether the English nation intelligently honours nobility for its own sake or no. Not that nobility should ever be exposed, in its naked self, to such an ordeal. It should always appear invested with that which is most esteemed, be it chivalry, ancestry, wealth, talent, or public virtue. In all things, the form and the substance should go together—the form as the safeguard of the substance, the substance as the life of the form. A poor nobility is a fiction—a stipendiary nobility is a tool. But it is somewhat suspicious that, in England, nobility and people should exhibit so little mutual intercourse, save that which is grudgingly given and manifestly selfish. The English seem incapable of hearty intercourse, except on a footing of equality. Between superior and inferior there is no true interchange of regard. The former despise the latter, while they stoop to humour them. The latter hate the former, yet cringe to dupe them. Too many, like Sancho Panza, are “haughty to the humble, and humble to the haughty.” The cold ostentation of charity, and the crafty hollowness of servility, can bind no classes together. Their guineas change hands; but their hearts beat responsive with few mutual sympathies. When the cry of the poor disturbs the rich, they throw him an alms, that they may think of him no more. And the poor have, on their part, lost true gratitude. In the highest and lowest grades

of English society are found equal measures of fickleness and insincerity, profligacy and improvidence, selfishness and meanness. The luxurious peer, who proudly denounces, or sanctimoniously laments, the demoralization and sedition of the people, has often set the example first, outraged by licensed sin the feelings, and roused by oppression the indignation of men, who, while knowing right from wrong, have not learned to wait for the righteous Judge. They are worthy of praise who set themselves to stem this tide of profligacy—the two arms of which encompass and threaten to submerge the solid mediocrity of the land. It is one omen of good, that “young England” (shall we add “young Spain?”) would restore what “young France, Germany, and Italy” would combine to abolish. Their heart is in the right place; venial be their errors.

English nobility, though not exclusive in its constitution, and far more influential in its relations than the German, is nevertheless an object of less attachment. Although the German baron, bidding adieu with a sigh to one privilege after another, wrung from him by poverty or public opinion, may, as “*laudator temporis acti*,” still worship in secret his double-eight-linked chain of ancestry, and look askance upon every fresh mis-alliance forced upon his order; still, in general society, he is most unassuming and accessible. His intercourse with other men does not degenerate into familiarity, as it would in England, where the haughtiness of the upper ranks and the insolence of the lower mutually repel each other. While the English peer, who marvels at the improvidence of the labouring classes, scandalously wastes long anticipated rents distilled through an alembic from tenants almost unknown, Germany hardly knows the class of farmers. Each baron farms his own estate. He knows his peasantry, and is known of them; talked with, walked with, felt, and handled as a man, and saluted with a kiss of honour. Though he may not know the world so well, he is generally better educated than the English nobleman. His morals are also better, and his household are more faithful. In England, alas! where justice and publicity are so much vaunted, one too often finds that “plated with gold” in the rich, which would carry to the gallows him in whom “through tattered clothes small vices do appear.” And if it be so, in spite of every facility for the expression of opinion, what would it be were those wholesome facilities diminished? There are few households to be found where master and servant are so estranged from one another by

conflicting interests; where the master so neglects, and by bad example corrupts, his servant; where the servant is so confederate against his master; and where systematic knavery, unthankful waste, debauchery, and insolence so pervade whole establishments, and openly defy all remedy, as in the west-end of London. These are things which provoke the Spirit of Christ, rend the bands of society, and almost excuse the boiling indignation of the Radical Reformer. Let the mere Conservative, indolent and supercilious, lapped in luxury, heedless of impending events, beware. God is no respecter of persons—He will not favour the wicked. Woe to the man through whom offence cometh!

There are, however, two respects in which the German nobility are behind the English: the one regards their public duty, the other their private pursuits. A nobleman is not (as Utilitarians, who let government, like public works, by contract, would have it) an *idleman*—a drone in the hive—because he does not fag at a plough, or pine at a desk. If there be anything worthy of honour in the earth, it is the office of a king. This none may pare down to the meanest balance of state or expenditure. And the prime business of the noble is to stand by the king. Nobility, worthily used, is not only the best stay of society, and the greatest ornament and bulwark of the throne, but the standing testimony that honour descends and depends from above, instead of springing up and being maintained from beneath. Where there is no throne—*i.e.*, where there is mere administration of a system, instead of government by a man—there can be no nobility. And if nobility fall, the throne, as a divine ordinance, will follow its fate. The monarch is not only the first of his citizens, but also the first of his nobles—of those on whom honour descends from Christ; and, deriving his power from Christ, he puts honour on those whom he approves. The qualities thus approved must vary with the time. As the twelfth century furnished its warriors, so does the nineteenth its judges—its statesmen—its merchants—its authors. But in all ages, the *rationale* is the same—“*Preis dem Verdienst*”—the descent of honour on the worthy. And if there be any spiritual reality in the ties of nature and the inheritance of blessing—if king and subject be not solitary atoms, without history or hope, “authors of themselves,” who “know no other kin”—if children should succeed to all which their parents can transmit, then nobility must assume an hereditary form. It

cannot always light on Marii, whose deeds are their ancestors'. The life-rent of nobility, though it may be traced in the English knighthood, and still more in the Spanish baronage and the French peerage, is even more incongruous than that of a throne. "Fortuna non mutat genus." Blood indeed

"Has crept through scoundrels ever since the flood ;

And after all—

" The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
The man's the gow'd for a' that."

Yet to the eye of faith, which sees the virtue of divine institutions, the short-comings of the noble will be no greater argument against his order than the sins of the baptized against the efficacy of holy baptism. Still, as all nobility has had a beginning, so its canon can never be closed. It must always obtain accessions from the ranks of public merit, and thus operate both in the encouragement of virtue and the maintenance of the whole tone of society. While even in Spain the *grandees* have, *ex officio*, a place in the upper house, and in Sweden the head of the noble family for the time represents the rest in the chamber of peers, the German nobles have no collective functions as hereditary counsellors to the King. They may grace his court, they may fight his battles, and conduct his diplomacy ; but they are not his peers—his girdle of strength. The very union of the German States, in origin, institutions, language, customs, and counsels, tends to give even their nobility a cosmopolite bias, which nothing but monarchy could have till now withstood. They feel the infection of that migratory spirit which the hope of gain or celebrity engenders in the citizen. But a greater cause of weakness lies in their overgrown numbers and impoverished condition. The children of the noble are all nobles. Primogeniture in title is entirely, in inheritance almost, unknown. The estate, subdivided as the children multiply, observes the inverse ratio of the claims upon it. Hence arises a class of men, numerous, needy, and isolated ; whose pedigree is disregarded ; whose privileges are gone ; whose cause is all but lost ; who, having interests opposed to those of other classes, tend to depress instead of elevating the rest ; and who can only cease to be injurious by becoming insignificant. The Emperor Sigismund was wont to say that he could make a thousand nobles in one day, but no one learned man

in a thousand years. The Hidalgo is the Fijo d'algo—the son of somebody. But if he would keep his place he must be somebody too; and not only have the most illustrious escutcheon, but be the most enlightened and patriotic man. Either the grandee must be the statesman, or the statesman will be the grandee. Unless the German nobility change their policy, they will be trodden down by those whose way they stop. It is matter of regret that short-sighted views and selfishness have so effectually neutralized the good effect of the late regulations, by which the present King of Prussia, connecting estate with title in future creations, has sought to secure permanence, and restore social influence to his nobility.

Unfortunately, remaining prejudices greatly hold back the nobility from every honest mode of bettering their fortunes. Bating the few possessed of large estates, or successful in diplomacy and arms, they drag out their existence in genteel poverty and idleness. They despise many occupations by which our fathers rose, and they share the weakness of all stipendiaries. The faculties of law and physic, scientific and mercantile pursuits, are all consigned to the plebeian. And, although one dare not rank the Christian priesthood among worldly callings, yet it is equally looked down upon by the titled classes. This, in a mere worldly aspect, is at variance with the principle even of German precedence in olden times, which gave the archbishop the rank of the duke, and the bishop that of the earl. But it has been well remarked, that the clergyman should be “a nondescript in heraldry,” neither higher nor lower than any in the scale of society; because he belongs to a category distinct from all, incomparable, because unhomogeneous. He is debased from his true dignity as much by precedence as by postponement to any rank in this world. A worthy associate for the highest, he should be the friend and confidant of the lowest. The individual should be so eclipsed by the office that he shall neither rely on a high rank, nor be impeded by an humble one. Were such a calling understood (a mystery of dignity to be attained by the call of the Holy Ghost, and finished in the kingdom to come), one which, in its lowest functions, any of the highest may be proud to fulfil, and they who would be patterns to others should delight to adorn; then, although it is enough for the servant that he be as his Master in reproach for his work's sake, yet none could be deterred from the Christian ministry by feeling it beneath his rank in society. It says little indeed either for

the discernment of its heavenly character, or for the devoutness [of Christian men, that the only countries and churches in which ecclesiastical office is sought by the nobility are those where emoluments and honours, almost princely, are attainable; and where to enter holy orders is in no sense to renounce the world. There have, indeed, been times in which, by men of family, the privacy and poverty of the pastoral office have been cheerfully undergone for the love of Christ's sheep. But, generally speaking, the clergy are either men who have gained, instead of losing, emolument and consideration by becoming so; or men who condescend to accept priesthood for the sake of rising to wealth and prelacy. Without looking at Rome, we may find this verified in the north and south of Britain. In Scotland, the pulpit, once occupied by the laird's brother, is now occupied by his tenant's son. And in England, the Church, sitting under the shadow of the Imperial Parliament, is thus, although yet kept alive by the remaining moisture of the soil, effectually deprived of the rain of heaven. Christ is served by sufferance of the State; and bishops, not bound together by apostolic rule, and uncontrolled, save by Parliament, have generated or tolerated an amount of schism and heresy which they dare not look in the face, or allow to be revealed. While one half of the godly manifest their piety by contempt of canons and articles, and another half exhibit it in idolizing them, the hopes of few or none are directed to the binding together of Christendom, the rebuilding and cleansing of God's whole temple, and, above all, to that which should have been the hope of the Church throughout—the coming of the Lord to raise the dead, to change the living, to judge His saints, and by them to judge the world. And, accordingly, here has the Church sunk to be, in the eyes of too many, only the most respectable of worldly professions—the provision of expectant scions—sometimes the resting-place of exhausted rakes. In both Germany and England the Church is the bondmaid of the State; but there it is poor—here rich and influential; and, for this reason, there deserted—here crowded with nobility. The Church cannot indeed be really honoured by the patronage of noble ecclesiastics; but it is fitting that Christ should have liberty to choose from all classes men to labour among all, and that there should remain no province of society in which it shall be held lawful to be ashamed of serving Him. There are many pious German noblemen, especially among the military, whose spiritual capacities are thus lost to the Church; but

who, if Christian ministers, would be the best witnesses against the combination of perverted learning and ignorant radicalism. The German Church will never prosper, and shake off the bonds of her neck, until the German nobility gladly minister for Christ; until the Church be lifted out of the mere mechanism of a department in the State; until the incomes of the clergy be so increased as to exempt them from the temptation to servility; and until those incomes be derived, not as a stipend from the State, as charity from a patron, or as wages from a multitude, but from their true source;—*i.e.*, from the *tithe*, paid in faith, without scrutiny or compulsion, out of every Christian's annual increase—that tithe which belongs to Jesus as Lord of the Earth and Priest after the order of Melchizedek; which He receives as the symbol of our homage; which He gives to His priests for the maintenance of His altar, independent of all men; and for the robbery of which the windows of heaven are shut, and the blessing of God restrained.

SOCIETY.

“Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos?” . . .
HORACE.

THE German is more amiable, accessible, and gregarious than the Englishman; but he fails in that bracing up and precision of limit and boundary which give to the English character its strength. The house of the Englishman is his castle, through which no man may drive a high road, and which cannot be turned into a market-place. Yet it wears an aspect rather of prohibition than of welcome and protection. His sign rather warns off trespassers than invites travellers. And though you may find comfort and steady sincerity in his house, you have little inducement to enter it. On the other hand, although the frequent desolations of war have swept away from Germany those detached dwellings which form the charm of untroubled England, and have gathered the inhabitants into villages; yet, except where rendered suspicious by the abuse of confidence, or heartless and punctilious by the exotic manners of a capital, the German stands honourably distinguished for a frankness and breadth of hospitality, which opens to strangers, furnished with the most inadequate introduction, the privilege of his intercourse and the comforts of his house. The Englishman's precautions often do injustice to his heart. The amount of faith bordering upon credulity with which the German runs the risk of imposition, for the sake of showing kindness, is a pleasing remnant of the by-gone time, when the word of man was its own proof, and when unchilled kindness found instinctive response. Yet the friendship of the German is not so easily obtained as his hospitality, and, when obtained, is perhaps not so valuable as that of the Englishman. In the German family, the females are too engrossed with domestic affairs to have much leisure for strangers; and the corporate unity of the family under the father and master, as a head of blessing and rule, is little understood. Although the German has not the volatility of more southern Europeans, and although the members of

one family have many occupations and enjoyments in common, yet their joint occupations are the fruit more of concert than of organisation. That sentimentality which, by apparent paradox, is so often found among them associated with a measure of heaviness and want of polish—nay, that very gregariousness of the people which carries them into public places from the mere love of seeing their kind, contributes to make the German household a body too permeable to be solid. Breakfast, the true family meal of England, at which the whole household pass muster, in spite of their diligent business habits, and arrange the work of the day, is in Germany eaten by each in privacy, or by all at different times. Even among the pious, morning and evening family prayers are rarely offered. The household, poetic and musical though the nation be, awake without family praise, and retire to rest without any cleansing of the burdened conscience. Throughout the day they have no corporate and definite transaction with God; they do not receive the blessing of a head—they are not referred to or reminded of Him by any domestic appointment. The chief family meal is commenced, either without preface at all, or with a silent devotion by each, as if he were alone in the world, or by some sentimental effusion from the lips of a child. But the real transaction by which the father and master, appointed by God to be the sole provider for, and priest over his family, offers to Him as he rises, ere he rests, and ere he tastes God's bounty, thanksgiving and prayer, which none but he is competent to offer for the family—this is a thing almost wholly unknown. Those mawkish, vague, and dreamy eulogies of spurious love, half human, half divine, which lose sight of fixed moral principle, violate Christian verity, and overstep social laws, which Schlegel once roamed among in search of his "eternal unity," and the taint of which is to be felt in celebrated stanza of Schiller—

" Selig durch die Liebe
Götter, durch die Liebe
Menschen Götter gleich :
Liebe macht den Himmel
Himmlischer, die Erde
Zu dem Himmelreich."

these form an unseen barrier against the solemnizing admission, searching power, and purifying control of truth in the German mind. The Bible, dusty or decorated, is more boasted in than read. That national idol—"Gottes

Wort"—the impersonal foundation, the deaf and dumb judge, of ultra Protestants, is, like every idol, barren. Yet, with less apparent polish, Germans are our superiors in refinement of feeling and mental culture. To ascend from the lower ranks of society, on whom education is forced by law, there are few females in the middling classes, and still fewer in the higher, who are not generally read in the current literature of the day, and disposed to take an interest in its discussion. And the tenderness of their feelings, did it not border on morbidity, would possess a peculiar charm. But the snare of the Germans is to delight in conversing with an ideal world, and not with things as they are. Their "Gemüth" and "Einbildungskraft"—their sentimentality and imagination—destroy the equilibrium of their powers, and lead them captive they know not whither. Their hymnology everywhere betrays this; so do their church-yards, filled with decorations, intended to persuade men that, after all, the king of terrors is a pleasant friend, to ignore the stern fact that death is the great sacrament of the curse on sin, and to hide the hope of the Lord's return as the only Deliverer of the groaning world. Such self-deception may harmonize with the quaint old epitaph—

. . . "My soul is banished quite
Unto its everlasting home."

But what has it in common with the manly faith of Prudentius in the future change of our vile body?

"Quid nam sibi saxa cavata,
Quid pulchra volunt monumenta?
Nisi quod res creditur illis,
Non mortua sed data somno."

Were there not among the Germans a false longing for emotion, they never could have been led to quaff so greedily the cup of Goëthe's devilry, and Bulwer's licentiousness, and to sigh and weep over writings professedly religious, in which pathos is the sole piety—compromise, the sole charity—inclination, the sole law—in which "Gefühl ist Alles"—feeling is all.

No one can fail to admire the strength of domestic affection so frequently and sometimes so naïvely exhibited among Germans. But where its ardour does not operate as a family bond, the sense of obligation too often fails. With all his apparent sluggishness, the German is, to an almost incredible degree, the creature of impulse; and where that impulse runs counter to duty, there lies his greatest danger.

Partly through the fault of remiss parents and masters, the "verba anomala" of Luther, the relations of children to parents, of servants to masters, bear few marks of faith in safe guidance, or of self-denying submission to control; and although servants are not so insolent or corrupt, they are more passionate and lawless than in England. The multiplication of the legal grounds of divorce, beyond those recognized by the Church, so as to bring the conscientious clergy into the most painful dilemmas, show how loose are the domestic ties, how lightly regarded the breach of them, and, on the falsest pretexts, how frequent the postponement of duty to feeling, in accordance with the "Wahlverwandschaften" of that arch-corrupter, Goëthe. It is not uncommon for a man to have been married to six surviving spouses in succession; and a lady has been known to sit at a card-table with three successive husbands. So jealous are the Germans of their privileges in this matter, that no proposed law has produced greater excitement among them than one intended to set marriage on its scriptural basis, to limit the grounds and increase the solemnity of divorce, and to stamp with reprobation the offending party. It is even said that many couples who anticipated an ultimate separation, have hastened it, to avoid the operation of the new law. Although the facilities of divorce may at first sight appear preventive of vice, yet such trifling with a tie which lies at the foundation of society, and which is sanctified, though not created, in the Church of God, cannot be justified as a means to an end; and if it ameliorate society in one way, it must only corrupt it more deeply in another. Moreover, one cannot fail to regret the deep loss which families sustain through the lack of pastoral superintendence and personal instruction. The ministrations of the pulpit being either philosophical essays, or continual repetitions of the first elements of the Gospel, without progression to perfection in the faith, are not followed out by due domiciliary visitation, so as to make more special application, or to cherish the working, of the truth. The seed is left to be caught away to wither or grow rank, as it may. And there is many a sore family breach and scandal which, without the least undue interference, the pastor might have healed or prevented by due warning or counsel. The household have none to tell them their true state; evil is not revealed in order to be put away; good is not rightly directed; and although the children are most carefully catechized before partaking of the Lord's Supper, all care of

them seems to cease with that solemnity, which, being regarded rather as the diploma of a Christian than as the food of his life, is too often never repeated—nay, by some regarded as a decent farewell to the house of God and the prejudices of childhood.

It is astonishing how readily men take a hint to sin. Luther, a man excusably enough lacking in reverence for ecclesiastical authority, and not distinguishing between the traditions of men and those holy traditions of God in the Church which attest the continual presence of His Spirit and harmonize with the scope (though they cannot quote a text) of Scripture, uttered an unguarded doubt as to the divine sanction of the Lord's-day. And the whole of his countrymen have run off with this doubt, which, had it leant to the side of stringency, they might not have so highly valued. Never, indeed, in the Christian Church, has the Lord's-day been kept in a manner at once so rigid and so little appropriate as in Scotland—a country in which, though the most anti-papal, the judaizing and legal bondage of the Papacy is equalled, if not surpassed, by devout persons; where Old Testament institutions and examples poison with gloom and pride the amenity of the Christian life; and where the Lord's-day—which should be observed as a day of spiritual, not carnal, joy and feasting, of active worship and well-doing, and of chastened yet cheerful domestic intercourse—is degraded to the rank of a Jewish Sabbath—fenced by prohibitions—occupied by negatives—a bugbear, like the metaphysical Assembly's Catechism, to every child—and yet a day on which the godless take a licence only the more reckless from the irksomeness of the yoke they have shaken off. Nevertheless, this is safer, if not better, than the continental desecration of the Lord's-day, which appears in Protestant Germany in a more offensive form than in Roman Catholic countries. In the latter, the joy of the flesh riots where the joy of the Holy Ghost should reign: yet the day is always begun with religious services—and those, not the tickling of itching ears by a popular preacher, but true acts of worship. On the contrary, in the former, the curse of labour, in addition to the joy of fools, breaks in upon the sacred rest of God.

“The sore task

Does not divide the Sunday from the week.”

That competition which in England accelerates business, in Germany prolongs it. Deep into the Lord's-day are carried the labours of agriculturist, artificer, tradesman, and student.

Apprentices are detained from every place of worship until the hours of worship are past ; then they are driven forth to seek their hard-earned recreation in the haunts of wickedness ; and instead of being allowed the evening of the previous day for domestic arrangements, they take the whole of the succeeding to recruit from their Sunday's debauchery. And, as a proof of how much more powerful is prejudice than principle, the very persons who profane the Lord's-day, and absent themselves from God's house, observe feast-days throughout the week with a strictness almost insuperable, which they may relax for pleasure, but which they will not yield to the most urgent and innocent business. Yet, after all, the whirl and bustle, the salutations and the coteries, the theatricals and the music, the smoking, talking, and feasting of a German Sunday evening—though they extort a sigh from the man who knows that communion with God to which all these thoughtless ones are called—have in them none of the venom of evangelical slander, or the madness of a London gin-shop. In the absence of better things, it were well could the British population find Sunday employments in which their joy would not be turned to strife, and their licence to destructiveness ; and in which man, if he will not be a saint, may at least avoid becoming a brute or a fiend. But temperance societies, and such other devices of man, however beneficially they may operate in counteracting more debased corporeal habits and cravings, can in the end do no more than cleanse the outside of the cup and platter, and fill the inside with diabolic pride. True temperance is the fruit of the Spirit of God. Where His operation fails, no other can succeed. Man may impose abstinence, but cannot create temperance. He can draw no blessing from setting aside any creature of God, as that which cannot be sanctified by the word and prayer. If his own volition or vow apparently effects that to which the Spirit of Christ was inadequate, the pride of self-salvation is his ruin. The great problem of the age is to bring the world to moral perfection without the fear or working of God. And the German governments, if they undertake its solution by encouraging what is called the temperance movement, may find too late in what direction it tends.

The cotton-mill-profit-and-loss levelling spirit has not prevailed to make open head in the daily intercourse of German life. Though the peasant exults in his relief from tenancy at will, ascription to the soil, and compulsory service—though the citizen boasts of his constitutional rights,

and the merchant of his monied influence, and all classes would fain dare to strike upwards,—the servant is not yet called a helper, as in America, nor do masters submit to be called employers. Though the priest has long sold to the State the integrity of his office, the king still refuses to be a function of his subjects; and, in spite of the treachery and self-interest of men, ungilded rank is not exposed to insult, and a measure of loyalty and condescension between inferiors and superiors remains. But the same social restlessness—the same consciousness to new powers, and intoxication with new prospects—the same haste to work—the same doubt of continuance—the same apprehension of a coming crisis—which are seen throughout all Christendom, are only the more apparent in Germany from being alien to the habits of the people. There, as elsewhere, we see the great paradox of the age—the materializing of all interests, and the spiritualizing, though not the sanctifying, of the principles on which, and the means by which, those interests are pursued. The mercantile and manufacturing classes, hitherto labouring and justly honoured as individuals, are now awakening to a confederate existence, and plying all subsisting institutions with the pressure from without, and from beneath, to which venal talent and learning give double intensity. In every land alike, though in various forms, contentment, founded on habit, not on meekness, yields to discontent. And ambition, springing not from a due consciousness of one's capacities and vocation, but from the swelling of pride, sets all classes astir for evil. Covetousness, which is idolatry, becomes the law of man's being; and the European Christian may now be looked to as a man who can teach the heathen, not to expect another world, but to extract from this enjoyment which they never knew before. He is a good neighbour who can give good dinners to the creditable, hoping for the like again, and leave the needy to the poor laws: he is doing well and getting on, who accumulates wealth. Those marry well who wed money, though they wed misery too; and the rich can always ensure the sympathy and friendship of men. To be rich towards God, content with food and raiment here, is a thing altogether out of date. Men grudge nothing to their lusts, but everything to God. They cannot bear to be tenants at will—mere stewards of His mercies. They can enjoy nothing without securing it against God. Money in the bank, acres of the earth, are surer than His favour. They lay hold on them as if they were eternal life, and hold them for twenty

or thirty short summers and winters, till their death "costs not the soiling one white handkerchief," and the gathered heap is scattered again. "Ums Geld ist die ganze Welt zu Kauf." The world may be had for gold.

In covetousness the Jew takes the lead. There are other Christian lands in which Jews are more numerous, and perhaps influential, but in no part of Christendom so educated and civilized as Germany is the Jewish element so great. The Jews—the true noblemen in the earth—once appointed to be the head of the nations by the special call of God, and yet destined to be so when they shall turn to the Lord—never divest themselves of the proud feeling that they are superior to every other race. This works in their spirits, even when labouring most to become cosmopolites. Insulted by the false boastings of Gentile Christians, who profess, but have not, that holiness and blessing which they accuse the Jew of having forfeited, and fortified in their rejection of Messiah by that example of Christians which should have left them without excuse, their thought is—"The villainy you teach me I will execute." Their habitual effort is to trip up and supplant the Gentile; and they long in their hearts for the day of retribution. Though the Jew is under such judicial blindness regarding all things spiritual (that is, all things pertaining to Christ, and expounded by the Holy Ghost) that he not only does not believe them, but has no conception of their existence, yet he has greater natural capacities than perhaps any other man. Although he is destitute of the divine key to unlock the mystery of creation, yet his understanding and use of things natural are pre-eminent. No doubt they are debased in character by the judgment which now rests on him for having sold his Lord and preferred old things to new; while, in the Gentile, they are ennobled by the vantage-ground which he occupies as united to the Son of God. Yet the Christian has received the Holy Ghost, not to make him wise in worldly things, but wise unto salvation. And, in so far as mere creature powers act on worldly things, the Jew has the decided advantage. He is ever insinuating himself into that inheritance from which he has been banished for a time. In Poland, he is the mortgagee of the earth—in Holland, the receptacle of its gold—in Germany, the astute student of its learning. And whether by relaxations on the part of Christian Governments, or by compromise on his part, there is no province of literature, and scarce any of public employment, into which he has not crept, and where he is not felt. There are

no doubt many real Jews who, still zealous for the law of Moses as divine, stand aloof from the amphibious worship of Jehovah, Jove, or Lord, in nondescript temples—who disdain to inherit with those nations whose sins they believe themselves to bear, and whose anti-latitudinarian honesty one must admire, while one laments their pride and blindness. And, on the other hand, there are some real Christians of Jewish parentage, men grafted by baptism into Him in whom is neither Jew nor Gentile, who have really found in Him the God of their fathers; and, merging the obligations and promises of the Law in the higher ones of the Gospel, are a true ornament to the doctrine of God and to their spheres in life. But the majority of those who still are Jews, having, in despair or dishonesty, renounced the hope with the yoke of their fathers, rush headlong into every employment and indulgence by which all vestige of singularity can be effaced. And of those who have become Christians, too many, baptized for gain and in hypocrisy, only reap, as members of Christ, a heavier judgment, instead of enjoying those higher blessings which they cannot appreciate. Like the blank leaf between the two Testaments, they stand between both, but show nothing of either, and are of all classes in society the most unprincipled—that is, the most destitute of a moral rule for thought or action. Those actively occupied in life can cast themselves as no others can—body, soul, and all—without reserve or scruple, hampered by no squeamishness, fettered by no prejudice, restrained by no considerations of obligation, into any occupation whatsoever, and are thoroughly venal in search of mammon, pleasure, or fame. And when they pass from exertion to enjoyment, their sphere of choice and investment is so limited by circumstances, that, although the generosity with which they spend their gold far exceeds the honesty of the means by which they made it, their wealth is generally lavished on those luxuries which most pamper and indulge the flesh. On the other hand, among the literary classes of Germany, there are none whose powers and hopes are so awake, whose consciences are so asleep, and whose habits so sweep and garnish them for the immovable occupancy of atheism and revolution, as the Judæo-Christian *literati*. When Antichrist shall be revealed, they will be the first to hail him as their Messiah, as their fathers in France hailed his precursor, Napoleon. And their confession to the Man of Sin will indissolubly rivet the fetters of delusion on the apostates of the Christian Church.

In fact, it is hard to say how the Jew is most dangerous. For while, as an infidel, he will bear testimony to the lie, as a believer, he will adulterate the truth. There is hardly a converted Jew who does not in his heart, more or less, retain in his right hand the Jewish promises, while embracing with his left the Christian. The lawlessness which always mingles with his piety shows how light he makes of the Christian polity. While he takes share with the Gentile in any blessing which may be going in the Church, he holds by inheritance something better and more definite, peculiar to the Jew, which can neither be annulled nor shared. Thus, instead of merging Moses in Christ, he adds Christ to Moses, and holds the latter the faster and more proudly of the two. Nor is this at all to be wondered at when one considers the gross ignorance of most Christians as to the pre-eminent standing of the baptized. Attaching no present divine efficacy to the sacraments—regarding faith in Christ as that which constitutes, and not as that which sustains the Christian—and not understanding that progress by which God has been raising man ever since his fall from one standing to a higher, until man has now attained his highest possible place as a member of the body of Christ—they regard their own position as the vague and fluctuating creature of doctrine or of feeling. Mere faith in God and Christ are things not peculiar to the Christian Church; nor shall the Christian alone receive salvation as the reward of faith. But one thing is peculiar to the Christian, that he is of the flesh and of the bones of the Son of God. There have been many Jews and Heathens far more faithful to their inferior standing than the vast majority of the Christian Church to their supreme one. Yet the judicial standing of one grafted into Christ, gifted with and indwelt by the Holy Ghost, and feeding on the Son of Man, is one totally distinct from, and elevated above, that of any other class of faithful men. And his functions in the kingdom to come, if he be faithful here, shall be equally distinct and supreme. For he shall reign with Christ, by whom His brethren are only blessed; and that by reason, not of anything in himself, but of the almighty disposal of God, who putteth His creature to what use He willeth. The Jew, although the head of the nations, shall only be, in the region of the natural, the visible reflection of that glory in the spiritual which the Church shall have when seated with Christ on His throne; and instead of rivalling the Christian with the independent blessing of a past dispensation, shall

draw from that new dispensation of blessing which shall flow from the glorified Church of Christ to all men in their respective order. As the future blessedness of the nations shall not affect the pre-eminence of the Jew, neither shall that pre-eminence of the Jew invade the supremacy of the Christian Church, composed of Jew and Gentile alike. Where, however, the Christian privileges are loosely held, one cannot hold out to the Jewish convert anything so definite and tangible as his previous position. The Christian is thus in danger of giving place to the Jew; and, instead of himself leading the way before all men, tends rather to join that train of heathen who shall yet follow the Jew as the blessed of the Lord. He endeavours to grasp, as man's highest hope in Christ, an earthly supremacy and blessing, which flesh and blood can inherit without the resurrection of the dead, the change of the living, and the renovation of the heavens and earth. The expressions of a living writer, who seeks to trace the influence of the Jew in the great transactions of Christendom, tend somewhat to sanction such ideas. And there is reason to fear that not a few Christians, longing after definiteness in their uncertainty, and seeking a sign, from their unbelief in invisible realities, are actually submitting to circumcision, as a more palpable seal and more certain channel of blessing than the now meaningless, because powerless, and powerless because faithless, ceremony of baptism. This is frequent in Judea. But we may find it nearer home.

The fever of liberality towards the Jews, which indicates the ignorance of the Gentile as to their present state and peculiar hope, is at its height in Germany. While among us the Christian counsellors of a Christian monarch, almost without one misgiving, recommend the devolution of her authority to men who do not belong to any different Christian persuasion, but who must, if at all honest, ever seek to destroy the name of Christ as that of an arch-impostor; we find the German liberals of every provincial diet banded together in the cause of suffering Judaism, and classing Jewish emancipation with national Parliaments, freedom of the press, and publicity of trial, &c., as things essential to the contentment of the public mind. To compassionate the Jew is right; but to compassionate him as a mere innocent sufferer is entirely to ignore the source of his sufferings. The Jew who does not believe that it was the Lord of glory whom he slew is, though not excused by his ignorance, intelligible in his complaints. But the Gentile

who knows how the Jew has sinned, and yet with infidel charity labours to give him, while yet unrepentant, social blessings which God withholds until he repent, is taking his part against God. In saying that the Jew should not suffer for his sin, he is saying that the act of the Jew was right, and the judgment of God unjust. In espousing the cause of him who crucified the Lord, he is himself prepared to crucify the Lord afresh.

THE LEARNED.

“Sir—He hath never fed of the dainties that are bred in a book; he hath not eat paper, as it were: he hath not drunk ink.”—
SHAKESPEARE.

THE German language surpasses all others in its powers of combination and its capacity to express philosophical ideas; and the Germans are undoubtedly the first students in the world. The students of other countries are isolated individuals, having no standing of their own in society; but in Germany they form a large recognized section of the body politic, a true republic of letters, the approbation of which men count worth the labour of a lifetime, and in which the manufacture of literature is unceasingly plied, and the rise and fall of the intellectual market observed with the anxiety of a stock exchange. The student, occupied with his appropriate trade, is not thereby severed from his family circle, like the recluse of other lands. He takes for granted the readiness of the public to underlie the burden of knowing whatever he chooses to make known. Every sacrifice is made to publish and to purchase. Everything is printed, from heaven, or earth, or hell. Words, pregnant with thought, inundate the land. Yet, after all, there is too much truth in Schlegel's description of his countrymen:

“Schamlos mehren die Bücher die schon im Druck sich erdrücken:
Tinte vergiesset das Volk immer noch thätig um nichts.”

This ceaseless literary parturition yields comparatively few results; and the influence of the learned, though increasing, is not equal to their estimation in society. This is mainly ascribable to their unpractical character. A great thinker, although more interesting, may be as idle as a great talker. The German is the theorist—the Frenchman the machinist—the Briton the workman. Although it is now the fashion for Germans to utter their resolves, to lash themselves into energy, and to talk big of their performance, all this only betrays their conscious defect. “Is se accusat qui excusat.” It is the hardest thing in the world to transfer anything German out of the region of discussion

into that of transaction; and with all one's admiration for the giant labours of the German in literature, one is obliged to confess that he knows more and uses it less than any other man, and to acknowledge, with Freiligrath, that

“Sein bestes Thun ist eben Denken.”

“His best work is thought.” The student, who, for ten long hours a day, in solitary slippered *deshabille*, cheered only by coffee, cold water, or tobacco, devours the thoughts of others, or, like a spider, spins out his own, at last emerges from his seclusion, either to hide in the napkin of professional drudgery all that had fired his youth, or to publish some work, intended to establish his fame, but exhibiting no picture of his own conscientious convictions, and having nothing in common with the occupations, prospects, or welfare of the living beings around him. Unlike the Scotchman, who carries out to the death the practical consequences of his belief, the German contents himself with carrying out his principles to their conclusions. Freiligrath, indeed, has sung—

“Land des Gedaukens! soll dein Herz
Reiben stets der Fessel Erz?”

“Thou land of thought, shall the metal of thy chains always gall thy heart?” Yet, in spite of such aspirations, the German is still fettered by the institutions under which he lives. Hence he takes his revenge by giving full swing to his thoughts; and, having no conception that man's duty to God extends to the control of his thoughts, he is determined to show his liberty in a region which he deems inviolable. With all his unrivalled and unwearied research, his ideas lack the bridle of literary self-command. He too often fails to obey the helm, and steer by the compass of strict induction. His maxim is, according to Gelzer, that “alles geistige”—everything spiritual (not holy)—is indicated, but not expressed, by words and apprehensions. Like the monk of Mount Athos, he thinks upon his thoughts till he adores them. His powers, once on the wing, disdain contact with mother earth. The “Gründlichkeit” with which he handles his subject actually entombs the reader. His inquiries begin at least with creation; and he acts the elephant in lifting the tiniest object.

No doubt a new style—the *astraptic* or *coruscant*—rapidly supplants the old with short sentences, pregnant aphorisms, and burning words; but, with some noble

exceptions, those who lead the way in its employment are the coryphæi of Liberalism, who boast in what man is doing and undoing. These "bold bad men," well called by Southey "the Satanic school," no longer reposing in dreams, are now filled with wild and dangerous hopes, with the outlines and designs of laws for that world to come which they await, and of which the hell-enkindled lustre, shooting through the cracks of present constitutions, now feasts their eyes, and tips their pens of fire. Rationalism, which most Englishmen have abhorrently regarded in Leibnitz, Wolff, Semler, and Kant as the native product of Germany, is much more her legacy from orthodox Rome and Greece, augmented by an importation from the infidel schools of England and France. The inquisitive and familiar character of the German mind may have fostered it, but its origin lies in the paralysis struck through every institution of God by the unbelief and wickedness of man. Neither piety nor infidelity commenced with the Reformation. The writings of the Greek Bessarion revived mere heathenism in disguise. Aristotle was more worshipped by Papists than Christ. Lights burned before the image of Plato; texts were taken from his works. It was proposed to alter the Vulgate, in accommodation to the times. Clement VII. approved of the classic hymns submitted to him by Zacharias Ferrerus, as preferable to those of the Church, in the celebration of her highest mysteries. And under Adrian VI. the inhabitants and the priesthood of Rome resorted, in time of pestilence, to the heathen sacrifice of an ox in the forum. The doers of such things as these were the men who, like the liberal George of Saxony, sided with Luther at the first, till they found him to be somewhat more than a *hero-destroyer of shams*. And we see only the revival of their spirit in the numberless modes in which the folly of vain man has since striven, through German philosophy, to be wiser than God, and has well-nigh succeeded in emasculating every sacred institution, and shaking to ruin every pillar of divine truth. We see but the same evil under new colours, in the grave proposal made in 1805 to substitute for the sacramental prayer at the altar the words of Goëthe's "Faust," beginning thus :

"Mishör mich nicht, du holdes Angesicht!"

and thus worthily proceeding—

"Nenn's Glück! Herz! Liebe! Gott!

. Gefühl ist Alles."

We see it in a new "confession of faith," that to do as

we would be done by, is the whole sum of the Gospel; in the bold avowal that "one cannot escape the conviction how great a hindrance to Christianity the completion of the so-called books of Scripture has been," and in that worthy substitute for Popery, the worship of self, of genius, and of matter, which "has already taken possession of so many altars, that there is not one left for any of the saints." We see it in the words of Frederick Schlegel, the sceptic, of which Frederick Schlegel, the devout Papist, would be heartily ashamed. "Every complete man has a genius. True virtue lies in the development of genius. . . . Man's proper business is a constant search after eternal unity in science and in love." We see it in the doctrine of Lessing, that all sciences and philosophical systems are "Göttliche Eingebungen"—divine inspirations. We see it in that "mystical absorption" (*Versenkung*) into nature which rises into pantheistic intoxication with idolatry of Schiller's "infinitely divided Deity." We see it in the complaint of Rückert—

"Das ist das Schmerz des All's
Ein Spiegel nur zu seyn"—

"The misery of creation is, to be no more than a mirror."

Kant is wholly out of date: Hegel, the perfecter of Spinoza, is in the ascendant. His doctrine is a mighty stride of devilry in advance. It is the first German system that promises to work, for it is a philosophy which tallies with principles in the breasts of all classes. But its work will be one of ruin, for the principles which it evokes are those of Antichrist. Its advocates are of various shades—half, whole, and ultra; and there are many who, in spite of its infection, preserve or have recovered a measure of faith and truth, although a far smaller one than they imagine. But in itself, it is unmixed *Anthropotheism*; not the exaltation of a creature to the place of God, but the assertion that a creature is the sole and essential God. It is the nearest approach yet made to the preparation of Christendom for receiving the Man of Sin. Its slime defiles some of the noblest minds in the land; and it possesses this remarkable character, that while in its esoteric aspect it is unfavourably abstruse, its exoteric is extremely popular, level to the capacities, akin to the thoughts, congenial to the habits, touching to the interests, kindling the lusts, of all. It boasts of being based on or confirmed by the "moderne Bewusstseyn"—the modern consciousness. In spite of the rejoicings of pietists that its refutation is accomplished, it

gains ground every day. And it is reasonable that it should ; for the delusion has a deeper root, and is of greater calibre, than any amount of truth which superficial textualists or religious society agents can oppose to it. If the vessel has been broken, it is that every child in the streets may play with its sherds. The denial—verbal at least—of a personal and living God is, alas ! no new thing. When Jacobi confessed to Him, the reply of Lessing was—"Da muss ich etwas ganz neues zu hören bekommen." "That is something I have yet to learn." But herein lies the bad excellence of Hegelism, that, while utterly expunging from creation, as the "*populäre Vorstellung !*" (popular representation) of Jacob Böhme, a personal Deity, while rejecting an incarnate Saviour, an indwelling Spirit, an inspired record, an Apostolic ministry, a present work of grace, and a coming day of judgment—while accusing Hume and his friends of "*Ueberschuss des Glaubens !*" (excess of faith) and Kant and his friends of obstinate belief in existence after death ("*dass sie davon nicht lassen wollen*")—its subtilty is such, that there is no point of Christian verity, no office of the adorable Trinity, no text of Holy Writ, for which it has not an appropriate niche in its temple of lies. It contradicts nothing ; it stultifies everything ; it confounds, neutralizes, and eliminates all objects of personal faith. It is the first truly philosophical system, which, denying a life to come, eternizes the present ; which, as by a wand of magic, transmutes the transmundane entire into the cismundane, and establishes the "*absolute Diesseits*" against the exploded "*Jenseits*." The thought of man is the fountain, the judgment of man the judge, of all things. The consonance of the fact with the thought—that is God ; the exhibition of that consonance—that is Christ ; the measure of its attainment—that is the Holy Ghost. Or otherwise, production is the Father—abiding product is the Son—the identity of the two is the Holy Ghost. The king is to be obeyed, not as the object of personal loyalty, but as the exponent of the thoughts of his subjects, or rather of his philosophers ; and, of course, if he expound them not aright, these new Jesuits, faithful to the sheep, may slay the royal wolf. The State is that stamp of thought which shall be eternal, that absolute power on earth to which the Church is but the temporary minister. And man, though as an individual born and mortal, is as man the eternal essence—"king, slave, and lord ennobled into MAN." Duty and responsibility, without a basis, are therefore without a sanction.

The infidelities of Semler and Strauss are the most innocent, because most palpable, form of this system of lies. It seems like a net without entrance or exit. Its meshes are at once too fine for the eye, and too strong for the hand of flesh, such as nothing but the power of the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus at God's right hand—can break or disentangle. By the Θεανθρωπος alone shall the ανθρωποθεος fall. Faithful and able men have wielded their pens against the system; but though they convict it, they cannot destroy it. It is truly the Catholic religion of Satan—the design for his human image. It is well styled by Julius Müller—"einen neuaufgeputzten, zu einem autolatrischen Genien-Cultus sublimirten Paganismus" (a paganism dressed up anew and sublimed to a self-adoring worship of mind). And if holiness lie in the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus, it is not to be wondered at that this philosophy of Antichrist should be one which, in the words of Molitor, "under the semblance of the highest ethics, is the direct opposer of morality and the total corrupter of man." It is Satan as an angel of light. A professed convert from the school, hailed, flattered, toasted, as a champion of the faith, has spent one winter in demonstrating the existence of an *abstract* God; he proposes to spend another in proving that of an *actual* God; and no one knows when he may arrive at the philosophy of a God *revealed*. They who do such deliberate violence to the religious consciousness of baptized men must not be surprised if others take up their unfinished work, and proceed by similar reasoning to explode the axioms and expunge the practice of national loyalty and domestic morality. Where is the Hercules who shall strangle these serpents? How shall this "Gigantomachie" (this war of the giants) be beaten back?

Germany, with such a volcano in its bosom, stands in two very opposite relations to the countries around it on the one hand, and to America on the other. However oppressive in its character, and extravagant in its consequences, the Roman Catholic tyranny over literature and science was, the controversies of Bonn and Paris between the Church and the University have abundantly proved, that if unlawful exercise of control over learning is an evil, its absence is one still greater. Lawless thoughts need but electric contact with lawless hands to blow up the world. The German has hitherto dealt with the algebra and logarithms, not with the real quantities of things. The American, essentially a doer,

has sought for principles to realize. Each has found what he sought. The American, without history or pedigree even in literature, unmellowed and uncultured, a *novus homo* in the world, has expressly avoided drawing from British sources, lest his doing so should compromise his liberty, and bring him under bonds to ancient institutions. The influx of American students, as well as English Dissenters and Scottish Presbyterians, into Germany, and their translations of German works, testify how congenial they find the soil of philosophical license and religious lawlessness. The caricature, compounded from German pedantry and American slang, of words pregnant with classic import bought up by the gross and misapplied in the "go-ahead" colloquial style of the new country—the sight of ancient garb and gait, plundered from the owner, and not fitted to the wearer, is not a little amusing. But the German has a secret joy in seeing his thoughts realized abroad to an extent which he dared not even imagine at home. What will come of it remains to be seen; but the marriage is one which augurs an evil progeny. On the other hand, while the German philosophy is rendered more liberal by being transplanted to America, it is itself that which fosters the liberalism and infidelity of its Continental neighbours. The Dane, the Swede, the Frenchman, the Italian, the Greek, the Hungarian, and even the Turk, but most of all the Russian, turns to Germany, in the hope of emancipation from the trammels of ancient prejudice. In Russia, the ruler and the ruled, though with different ends, seek, by a rare coincidence, the same things; the Emperor, seeking to cope with Europe by improving his intellectual breed, as a farmer his cattle; the people, stealthily awakening to a consciousness of their wants and of their power. The education, in search of which the literary emissaries of Russia are spread abroad, has no professed connection with religion. Indeed, it cannot; for it is sought at the hands of heretics. In point of fact, it will soon prove a Trojan horse, and subvert the institutions it is intended to sustain. Germany is the great magazine for every free-thinker and Liberal of northern Europe. And this is the more remarkable when we consider that there never was a time when she was nationally more at antipodes with both Russia and France! hating the duplicity, tyranny, and covetousness of Russia to such a degree that nothing but the alliance of the Courts prevents a rupture; and holding everything French at a discount, to an extent which the increased power of Prussia now renders safe.

The censorship of the Press now has the masses in every country against it, because it strikes, whether rightly or not, at the lawlessness of that tongue which walketh through the earth, and sets on fire the course of nature. Of its remaining advocates, some would prevent the publication of evil, some punish its publication. On the respective wisdom of these two courses, or of their possible combination, we need not here decide. But it is in vain to imagine that the German censorship has much efficacy in correcting the evils of German literature. Most European Governments, professing to keep the peace of this world only, are generally so careless of the higher interests of man, and so sensitive as to political offences, that the censorship which they exercise cannot be duly directed. Political disturbance is the great bugbear of every Continental functionary. In many countries criminality is attached to the use of certain words, even though that use be exactly the opposite of evil; upon much the same principle as that upon which the Roman Catholic finds a warrant for the worship of the saints in Rev. xxii. 8. "Morals," said an Austrian bookseller, in defence of his well-purged library, "are of less importance than opinions." If a man, with his tongue or pen, only steers clear of politics, he is accounted harmless. Religious faith and moral principle being regarded as mere matters of speculation, or as things affecting only the world to come, are lost sight of in the censor's control. If a book contains one or two, perhaps useful, political remarks, it is suppressed; but the most subtle licentiousness, flagrant immorality, subversive scepticism, destructive heresy, and revolting blasphemy, pass by wholesale. The censorship, as the conservator of public religion or morals, truly strains at a gnat and swallows a camel, because the censor himself either is an abettor of the evil, or cannot reach to where it truly lies. Of course an over-strict surveillance must share the blame where subsequent liberty runs riot; but it cannot be denied that the late specimen fruits of relaxed censorship have been such as to justify the German Governments in pausing ere they give further license. When, as old Claudius has it in his tale of the bear—

" Die Klügerer Widder schweigen still,
Laut aber werden Frosch und Krokodil,"

one is tempted to say for them—"Macht doch den Bären wieder los"—(loose the bear again).

Over the teachers in the Universities there is no efficient

moral control. Session after session, poison is, by one or more in every University, systematically and openly administered to the youth of the land—to the future shepherds of its flocks. Formal and normal schools of heresy are so organized, that one can only marvel how any pass through the ordeal of a University, nay, of a theological education, with a spark of faith remaining. That University is held incomplete in its furniture which has not among its professors the representatives of the most opposite opinions, in which the doctrines of the faith are not alternately maintained and impugned as theses in science, and where the divine truth taught in one room is not daily subverted in the next. No doubt this fact admits of explanation in regard to Prussia. The late King found the theological chairs, almost without exception, occupied by Rationalists. These he had no power to remove, and as he could not silence them, he resorted to the expedient of contradicting them, and tried to beat them from the field by the appointment of orthodox lecturers, who should operate as an antagonist force—an antidote to that poison, the administration of which he could not forbid. In this point of view the Universities are in a transition state, and the contradictions of their teachers betoken returning health. Still, such is the present fact. And how can it be otherwise, while the teachers of the rising generation are, not only as teachers, but, what is more important, as men, under scarcely any ecclesiastical control? It must signify little what impediments are thrown in the way of the utterance of their sentiments, if the hearts of the men, the fountain-head of these sentiments, are neglected and impure. Even those who do not despise regular attendance on the ordinances of religion, as a thing suited to the vulgar, but beneath a philosopher, and unconnected with theological science, attend on no one stated ministry. They are not led on to perfection from the beginning of the doctrine of Christ by careful and special pastoral instruction; they do not learn the truth as members of a flock, and in the communion of the saints; they are not trained to make common cause with other Christians in simple acts of worship; they draw their doctrine from what source they please, not from the candlestick of the Lord's house; they acknowledge no spiritual authority; they have the benefit of no ecclesiastical oversight; they receive no pastoral counsel, and would, perhaps, spurn it when tendered. They stand in that most perilous of all positions—too often the lamented position of a monarch—that of being without a

shepherd's guidance, of being flattered by all, of having none true enough to tell them the truth, none commissioned to care for their souls. Even among Mohammedans the maxim obtains that, "Whoever has no guide, the Devil will guide him." While, in England, the rich and the noble, although they may toy with the common-places of religion, are, like the poorest classes, yet from different motives, shamefully exempted from any close pastoral dealing with the conscience, the *literati* of Germany are the favoured, or rather the neglected, class. Hence their whole teaching is poisoned by personal faults and errors, which none reveal to them; and they have no safeguard against being led and leading into every devious path which the love of sin or singularity may dictate. Although all belonging to a Church which tolerates no schism, they are only on that account the more infected with heresy. One cannot predicate of authorized teachers what their faith is, or what, notwithstanding first appearances, it may turn out on nearer inspection to be. Paul certainly could not have, with propriety, addressed them, like Timothy, as sons in the *common faith*. It is said, rather in commendation than otherwise, of a theologian, that he has struck out a new path. "Er hat eine neue Richtung eingeschlagen." His success is measured by the number of youths whom he persuades to follow him on it. And the ministers of Christ's Church look on indifferent, if not admiring, while the most influential of her members mislead those destined to influence in their turn, and while tenets, uncontrolled by, if not adverse to, that which has been always, by all and in all places, believed, are instilled into those who shall occupy the pulpits and lectureships of the land. Nor is this confined to Protestants alone. The destructive *opinioniones piæ*, which the great custodian of the faith, the Roman Catholic Church, as a tender mother, cunningly permits her children to entertain and to promulgate, without sharing their guilt by any ostensible *imprimatur*, are often as much in harmony with the faith as black is a shade of white. That "Lehrfreiheit," that freedom of instruction, which is defended as the palladium, is really the upas tree of German Universities, and has been well parodied, "die Freiheit der Leere"—the freedom of emptiness.

The mental training of youth in Germany is undoubtedly much superior to that which obtains in England. With us there are, perhaps, a greater number of men generally accomplished, and thus fitted for public life. And if there is not now, there certainly recently has been among us, a

stricter moral culture. But, looking upon man as a philosophic being, while he receives in England mere objects of knowledge, he receives in Germany the capacity to think. While knowledge is with us traditional and empirical, and undergoes arithmetical increase, the German enters into its philosophy and absorbs it into his own circulation. The one, while less exposed to the danger of literary innovation, and sympathizing less with mere speculation, rather obstinately inherits what he holds than understands its bearings. The other, comparatively destitute of traditional reverence, is yet more likely to maintain to the uttermost what he has once on principle adopted, in so far as intellectual conviction can co-operate with moral and religious principle in producing fidelity. Yet the pedantic technicology with which the Germans load the most ordinary subjects, and pompously deck out the commonest truths, is much against their British popularity. We have no taste for intellectual swordsmanship, in which no blood is to be drawn. We dive for treasure, not for diving's sake. We hold excursion out of the real legitimate in poetry, which, as some one says, *founders* when *founded* on facts; but in philosophy we hold it out of place. The propounder of such dogmata as those of Fichte on the "Ich bin Ich, Ich bin nicht Ich, und die Idee an und für sich"—"I am I; I am not I; and the Idea in itself"—would among us hardly escape a straight waistcoat. There are few Coleridges in England.

The four crying evils of German science and education are—the intrusion of the intellect into sacred things—the separation of theology from religion—the separation of instruction from the Church—and the idolatry of talent and learning. Men have forgotten that the intellect is not the highest part of man's threefold being. His spirit is the highest. By it he holds communion with God; on it the Holy Ghost operates in making known to him the things of God; to it all action of the intellect, as well as of the body, should be subordinate. And although every part of man should participate in the worship and service of God, still it is on the condition that each should be duly subordinated to the other. This cannot be better expressed than in the words of Tauler, a divine of the fourteenth century: "The body should be the servant of the soul—the soul the handmaid of the spirit—and the spirit an impress of God." When the intellect addresses itself to sacred things otherwise than under the shelter of the communion of the man's spirit with God, it is no act of

faith, but only of presumption. And it is somewhat extraordinary that those who so justly condemn mere bodily service without intelligence, should be so guilty of exercising intelligence without the exercise of their spirits in communion with God. With us, a student who is not devout lets theology alone, and leaves it to those whom true piety moves to it, confining himself, if a Churchman, to the estimation of benefices, the search of patronage, and the enjoyment of good company. Theology is no essential of piety. Many a devout person is no theologian. But piety is an essential of all true theology. For faith in the Man Christ Jesus is the only door to the knowledge of God. And that theology is spurious which is not the knowledge of God. But in Germany theology and faith are disjoined. The faith is expounded as one of the sciences; the history of the Church and her doctrines is detailed as if there were neither sin nor righteousness in the whole affair; the Bible is studied with no sense of moral obligation, but as a mere exercise in philosophy. Men, careless to the salvation of others, occupy themselves day and night with the theory of it; and, though destitute of personal confidence towards God, inexperienced in the sprinkling of the heart with the blood of Christ, strangers to secret and neglecters of public prayer, they scruple not to tread with daring footsteps, think with profane mind, talk with profane tongue, and gaze with profane eye, on ground forbidden to all but those filled with the spirit of adoption. The German critical apparatus in theology has been well compared to glasses by which to see the sun without an eye. The Athanasian Creed says, "The right faith is, that we *worship*," &c. But

"Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

Although the progress of experience in the Church enlarges the development of dogma, yet, did her life also grow, she would, as Molitor justly says, always have the dogma in herself, and be more occupied with showing than with settling her faith. And it is a bad omen indeed that the very age in which spiritual life is lowest, is that in which dogmata are most expounded. It is the unsettling, not the expounding, of the faith. Everything has been discussed, till there is little certain left. Opinions may change, but the relations of God and man cannot. The Apostle John says, "Which thing is true in Him and in you." The truth personal alone is real.

The deadening influence of German study on all spiritual

life arises, not so much from its amount, as from the unlawful mode in which it is conducted. From its callous familiarity arise an indifference to good and evil, and a separation between the personal character and the most vital opinions of men. If the Scotchman quarrels with all from whom he differs, and through that *odium theologicum* from which Melancthon on his death-bed rejoiced to have escaped, denies his opponents even the common charities of life, the German will too often receive into his house those who strike the deepest wounds at Christ, and bid "God speed" to every heretic who has science or genius to recommend him. Nathan der Weise, with whom, in Lessing's tale, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity are three rings bestowed by one Father, is by many deemed the model of true religion and Catholic charity. Indeed, one must allow that the candour of the Germans, at first sight so amiable, is too often found to proceed from the fact, that the questions which are life and death to other men are but entertainment to them, having no hold on their consciences, and changed as easily as their conversation. That "*Ausgleichung der Gegensätze*," that reconciliation of opposites, attempted on the basis of some higher unity, is too often a mere amphibious middle term, which is neither truth nor falsehood; and the so-called development of truth, to suit the times, is either its mutilation, or else its clothing in some garb, which, like the shirt of Hercules, shall slay it, in order at once to escape the censure of those who value truth, and to evade the scorn of those who will not bear it. It makes no practical difference on a man's conduct how his speculations turn out, whether for or against those truths which lie at the foundation of all true morality. Everywhere we are presented with the enigma of Atheists, Pantheists, Naturalists, Rationalists, and Revolutionists equalling, if not surpassing, the most orthodox in the discharge of their relative duties, and in the interchange of the amenities of life. Things are debated with all the earnestness of realities, which lead no one to any positive act or any change of conduct. And, on the other hand, men, professed champions of religion, bulwarks of orthodoxy, students and expounders of the profoundest mysteries, handlers of questions which are the most comprehensive, and ought to be the most practical, as to the government, worship, and instruction of the Church, are seen without any token of real godliness, without acknowledgment of submission to, without sanction from, any spiritual authority. If shepherds devoid of Christ's

love are but destroyers, theologians devoid of it are profane triflers. On them words of truth are wasted. The further you bring them, the less you succeed. It is like writing on the waters. To this familiarity with things holy, stands, as the counterpart, an equal familiarity with things unholy. To enlarge the boundaries, to multiply the provinces, to deepen the investigations of science, is the cynosure of the German's being; with him every phenomenon is fair game, and every fact is truth; and the Holy Spirit, save among pietists, is the spirit of science, rather than the Spirit of God. "*Geistig*" and "*geistlich*" are words too often confounded. It matters not whether the facts observed be wrought of Satan or of God. Man, being lord, has all at his command, and in the sacred cause of science may safely investigate all things, and use the most equivocal means. And if the scientific hero, armed with his fancied commission, clothed with his fancied panoply, can conquer a province or win a fresh laurel, it matters not whence his conquests come, or whether his chaplet be death to himself. But who can handle pitch without being defiled, or fire without being burnt? As faith in the living God decays, so does faith in God's living enemy: the wise is taken in his own craftiness; he observes and reasons without the fear of God; therefore he cannot choose the good and refuse the evil. His moral sense is stupefied; and as sentiment without morality ruins the unlearned, so do intellect without faith, and knowledge without worship, the learned. Well has Frederick Schlegel sung—

"Geistlich wird umsonst genannt
Der nicht Geistes Licht erkennt;
Wissen ist des Glauben's Stern
Andacht alles Wissens Kern."

It has been remarked, that every man's forte is his foible; and the Germans truly destroy themselves in that wherein they are most useful to the world. To be under law, although so contrary to man's rebellious will, is so inherently accordant with man's constitution, that they who cast off the law which they should obey always come under some other. They who subvert a legitimate government frame one of their own; they who reject a divine priesthood set up a human; they who reject the true Christ will have a false one. The witchery of every false guidance attests the power of the true. The profane are the greatest worshippers of what they like: the lawless the greatest slaves of what they follow. And in Germany, where all principles, except those

proximately connected with political administration, float unanchored at the mercy of the wind and tide, the coryphæi of the various philosophical and theological systems receive and live by what is almost adoration. Even among Roman Catholics, who profess faith in divine ordinances, the idolatry and flattery of persons is the more revolting that it contradicts their principles. They who, professing to worship God, will not worship the MAN CHRIST JESUS, or bow to any sent of Him, lavish their worship on distinguished men. They who ridicule Romish hagiolatry can invoke without scruple the deceased champions of man's pride, to "pray in their heaven for the steadfastness of their countrymen, and to breathe into them their own spirit." Blinder devotion never was paid to dead men's bones than to the thoughts of Luther dead :

"Jahrhunderte versenken;
Unsterblicher Gedanken
Gebilde athmen noch."

And if men could but see it, they never were so prostrated before the person or word of a Pope as now in the theological or scientific circles of Germany before a favourite teacher. What Claudius has sung of a king may well be sung of a "Gelehrter: "

"Ich danke Gott mit Saitenspiel
Dass ich kein König worden;
Ich wär geschmeichelt gar zu veil
Und wär vielleicht verdorben."

Accessible and affable as the German philosopher is, it is always expected that, in some form or other, you shall burn incense at his shrine. Every man who starts on his literary career, starts an idolater of talent and learning: farther advanced, he carries, in his absorbed manner and ethereal complacency, the proof that he numbers himself among those of a superior order: and when the learned meet, if they do not differ, it is on the tacit understanding that each shall minister gratefully to the self-esteem of his neighbour. But, to be serious, it may be said of them, How can ye believe which receive honour one of another? That honour which is based on high talents, is a greater enemy to faith than that which rests on riches or power. It refuses to perish either *by* or *for* the truth. The man who prizes it can do positively no work for God. The *theorist in religion* is more hostile to it than the *practitioner in vice*. And while the showy men in the Christian ministry will be left behind

by the practical clergy, the most favourite expounders of theology will be the most inveterate rivals of divine government, and opponents of heart-searching discipline in the Church.

The professors in the Universities are too sensitive to make a stand for truth in opposition to the clamour of the many, or the frown of the influential. It is doubtful yet how the new interrogatory system, lately recommended to the German Universities, will work. There is no doubt that the laws of the Universities, while exempt from that exclusiveness, at least in the letter, which characterizes the English, are at present inoperative in compelling study or preserving morals; and, although constant hearing is enough for the studious, supply will not create demand in the idle. But it is to be feared that the opening of another course may give occasion to discussion which the professors may not be able to regulate or put down. Much depends on the personal character of the professors themselves. And it is pleasing to contemplate many in Germany who are models of that paternal kindness which is calculated at once to encourage the student, and to keep him out of the way of temptation.

The periodical Press of Germany is a weapon not yet so expertly, but on the whole more temperately and honourably, wielded than that of England. "Neither man nor woman, by writing a book, becomes the subject of criticism. The book is the occasion, and ought to be the limit." Were this excellent rule better observed, the periodical Press would, at the expense of its spice, gain in real influence, by holding private character sacred.

The literary and religious Press of Germany is nearly as omnipotent as the political Press of England; but it is not the instrument by which Germany is to be regenerated in a manner acceptable to God. If the idols that have a name must be broken down, the nameless must be so also. God will recognize no impersonal saviour. The Press is not the proper engine, even were that which issued from it true. We are saved by faith; and if we believe, it is the word of a faithful man we believe; but the word of an impersonal book can be toyed with by the intellect, and is seldom accepted by any act of faith in the spirit of man. As Goëthe says, "*Das Wort erstirbt schon auf dem Feder:*" the word dies upon the pen. They whom Jesus, the faithful witness, gives to His Church, are they whose word of faith shall kindle faith, shall deliver men from barren and uncertain notions, shall work in them the certain knowledge and active perform-

ance of His will, and shall dispense His truth, not in the indiscriminate and profane and irresponsible manner of the Press, but in those words, and in that degree, and with that sense of responsibility, which suit the sacredness of the subject, the measure of spiritual capacity in those addressed, and the nature of the object to be gained. Besides the reserve of the Papist in the dishonest *suppressio veri* to gain an end—and that of the Tractarian in substituting religious injunctions and exercises for the Gospel of the Son of God, lest the mystery of His Incarnation should be profaned—there is a reserve which is at once honouring to God and merciful to man ; the reserve, not of craft nor of fear, but of wisdom and love—for which we have our Lord's example, and which indiscriminate publication and discussion of divine mysteries must injuriously violate. But science is now more secure than religion against newspaper profanation. With the latter, though few delight to practise it, all hold themselves entitled to meddle.

One is glad, however, to feel that the views above expressed on the subject of German science apply rather to the state out of which it is emerging than to that in which it promises to abide. The very aggravation of its evils in some quarters is a token for good, as indicating that elements of good and evil, hitherto dormant, in unseemly juxtaposition and mixture, will not coalesce, but must separate as they become active, and have begun to gather each to its own. In science, as in theology and politics, the present efforts of men to effect syncretic unions, and to bind in confederacy persons and things unhomogeneous, are meeting with constant defeat at the hand of One who is higher than men. For the mystery of godliness and the mystery of iniquity must both be brought out distinct. Men must side with one or other ; and they must learn how far they differ before they can truly agree. There is certainly arising, among the learned of Germany, a class of orthodox, able-minded, true-hearted, wholesome, practical men—at once emancipated from the clumsy pedantry of a past age, and preserved from the unprincipled smartness of the present—purged from the heresies, the literary pride, and the lukewarmness of Rationalism, yet preserved from the morbid, ill-furnished, uncatholic zeal of Pietism—able to influence the times without being infected by their spirit—aware of the true field on which, and, in part at least, of the weapons with which the battle must be fought—destined to restore the broken connection between science and religion,

and yet to vindicate for the truth its vestal simplicity, and for God's ordinances in Church and State their divine standing and authority. With these men are bound up the true hopes of their country. These form "Young Germany," properly so called.

THE CHURCH.

“Delicta majorum immeritus lues,
Romane, donec templa refeceris.”—HORACE.

It is not expedient that a *person* should leave us and supply his place with an *influence*, but it is expedient that he should go to receive a kingdom and return, and that he should send a person in his stead till his return. That kingdom is Christ's; that person sent is the Holy Ghost. The two leading causes of declension in the Church have always been her failure to look for Christ's return, and her intolerance of the Holy Ghost as her Comforter in His absence. The one reconciled her to an earthly home; the other betrayed her love of earthly things. Frederick the Great has well said, “Der sich still hält, der wird selten verfolgt :” he that stands still is seldom persecuted. Under persecution, the children of God, instead of crying for His kingdom, cried for respite and ease without it; and as soon as they slackened in their labours to attain that kingdom, and began to cleave to and enjoy the earth like others, their persecutions ceased, because they no longer disturbed the kingdom of Satan. Pressure is the true attitude for the growth of the Church. It shuts her up to God, as John in Patmos. She longs for ease and breathing time, and when she gets them she perishes through sloth and seduction. Whosoever will be the friend of the world is the enemy of God. The Church, in so far as she welcomes the friendship of the world, has in so far become the enemy of God. Until His kingdom come, her calling is to be hated of the world. But, instead of leading men to seek a home absent and future, she adopted theirs. She learned the ways of the heathen, instead of teaching them those of Christ. She prophesied *for* the great and the wise of Christendom, instead of prophesying *to* them. Having become impure, the children of God instinctively shrank from Him who is a consuming fire. They could not bear naked exposure to the light—unsheltered contact with the Spirit of Christ; and they were fain to seek a shadow under which they might comfort themselves, and escape the torment of God's presence, without daring to

disown Him. At one time they took refuge in the favour of an emperor; at another, under those Jewish shadows of which they refused to be the substance; at another, in heathen customs, which they should have abolished; at another, in multiplied or imposing ceremonies, which stifled the faith in vieing with the world; at another, in bald and solitary devotions; at another, in attempts to purchase by works that peace with God from which these should flow; at all times, in something religious, which does not amount to communion with the Father and the Son. Patronage from the great, popularity with the many, has at once buried the life, and subverted the government, of Christ. It is, in the words of Myconius, as if the Lord, instead of governing His Church by men, had, from His ascension onwards, resigned it into their hands. So long as Christianity keeps the peace, and gives adequate pledges that it will civilize this world, and not bring in the next—so long as it observes a judicious *reticence* as to its supernatural character and end, as to the fellowship of Christ's sufferings and the power of His resurrection—so long as men clearly understand it to be no more than a congeries of meaningless proprieties, soothing to the conscience, lubricating to society, and helpful to the powers that be—so long it is popular, in any and every form. Men praise, adorn, endow it, boast of it, serve it with many sacrifices. But let the Spirit of God and Christ manifest Himself, and operate to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and judgment—let Him be really felt to occupy His temple—let the Church give token of being a divine polity—exhibit a holy vitality which makes no truce with sin—enter into mysteries which pass the ken of man—and exhibit powers which speak a present God; let her be seen, like Noah, preparing in good earnest for the end—for the resurrection of them that sleep, the change of them that wake, and the return of Christ into the world to judge quick and dead, and make all things new;—then do all as one man despise, suspect, traduce, denounce, persecute, and vote the truth away. The prelate superciliously frowns—the pietist sanctimoniously sighs—the theologian orthodoxly condemns—the philosopher convincingly re-argues—the pious worldling laments its injudiciousness—the impious worldling detects its hypocrisy—the man of the nineteenth century smiles at its exploded folly. By fair means or foul die it must; and it is well if they who confess it do not share its fate. But truly it were better if they did. For the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not

seen, has been long so weak in the Church, that men have not had strength to bear the penalties of confessing Christ as the fountain, and the Holy Ghost as the essence of life—Christ's Apostles as the rulers, and His perfection as the standard, of the Church. Satan, where he could not overcome by rage, has always defeated by craft. And while, on the one hand, he has frequently sought to render his delusions more plausible by bringing upon their victims a counterfeit of the reproach of Christ, he has as frequently destroyed by popularity the cause which he could not put down by persecution. Some royal, noble, rich, wise, creditable man—some influential section—some approving majority of society—becomes the patron of the struggling cause, and lifts it into favour and failure at once. The witnesses for the truth find acceptance, but lose their power and their crown. The truth itself is as unpopular as ever. The wind blows now from this quarter, now from that. Men range themselves now under this banner, now under that. Each builds his house on the earth, and covets the gifts of God, in order thereby better to assert his own place and name. But Christ's honour lies in the dust. For His cause, apart from their own, none are jealous. His glory is strangled in the birth. His way is not prepared. His presence is that nuisance which all agree to abate. The tokens of that presence are counted a mark of infamy. The Church, which will not be the temple, becomes the tomb of the Spirit of Life. It stones the witnesses whom it cannot silence or gainsay. And the terrible occupation of the Church, from the beginning, has too often been to purchase external favour and internal peace by excommunicating its Head.

Much as the Church in Germany before the Reformation deserves and rewards observation, still the Reformation is that which prominently presents itself to the mind when Germany is contemplated in its moral aspect. Antichrists there could not be till Jesus had been made both Lord and Christ. But as there were Antichrists even in the Primitive Church, so, ever since, the spirit of Antichrist has wrought in preparing the way of the last great Antichrist, whom the Lord shall destroy with the breath of His mouth, and consume with the brightness of His coming. To those who know the justice and mercy of God, it must be evident that this Antichrist would never be permitted to practise his delusions and perpetrate his blasphemies in the Church unless the Church had for centuries, in every possible form,

herself permitted their beginnings. Of these beginnings the Papacy is full, whether it may or may not be the theatre of their consummation. And therefore, without asserting, as Luther did, that the triple-crowned Pope was the enemy of God, religion, and the empire—government, society, and marriage—we must admit that the Papacy was justly denounced by the Reformers as the Antichrist of their day—a system which Ullman well calls “den die Wirklichkeit magisch verhüllende Schleier”—the veil which magically disguised the reality. In saying that “every great error of mankind covers a deep truth, and indicates a deep necessity in the breast of man,” Möhler has, even while regarding the Reformation as such an error, explained its rise. To detail the practical evils under which the Church then groaned were here needless. Every pious Roman Catholic admits them. Frederick Schlegel, himself a Roman Catholic, acknowledges the evil to the full in his “Philosophy of History;” and, while condemning the Reformation, not only does justice to the character and motives of the Reformers, but acknowledges the blessing which would have resulted from reform wrought by God in the way of unity through those who bore rule in the Church. The Council of Pisa professed to meet “ob generalis reformationis ecclesiæ dei tam in capite quam in membris evidentissimam necessitatem;” and determined “quod ipsa sancta synodus non dissolvatur nec dissolvi possit, quousque universalis ecclesia in fide et moribus tam in capite quam in membris sit reformata.” It went so far as to call on the Emperor Maximilian for aid. And the Diet of the Empire, held under the Emperor, recovering the long-lost distinction between the Catholic Church and the Papal system, prepared the way for the practical separation which followed.

He that will rule must obey. He that bids men hearken to him and follow him must himself hear and follow Christ. He should ever be able to say in truth, Be ye followers of me as I of the Lord. As a holy Church is a divine epistle to the world, so should he be to the Church. He must have his ear open to fresh instruction through every channel, and must not dream that he is sufficient to himself. If he act otherwise, he becomes a hypocrite, a tyrant, or both—unjust through usurpation, profane through prostituting his true place. Such had the clergy of Christendom become. As the doctrinal and practical errors of the Papacy were its mere accidents—and its essence lay in this, that the Church had fallen from heaven to earth—so were the doctrinal

defects and practical evils of the Reformation its mere accidents ; and its essence lay in the striving of the Spirit to lift the Church from earth to heaven again. It was one of those labour pangs of the Church which, though they may cease for a time, must precede, and do surely indicate, with an increasing nearness, the bringing forth of the glory of Christ at His appearing and kingdom. With all the professed severity of her discipline, the Roman Catholic Church has signally acted the part of the unjust steward, who changed the bills of his lord's debtors. For while she has multiplied men's obligations to the Church, she has diminished their obligations to the Lord—has hid from their eyes the inflexible standard of perfect holiness—and has virtually severed herself from Christ, by making it possible for men to be zealous for her glory while utterly neglectful of His—while indifferent, nay hostile, to Him—at peace with her while at war with Him—blameless, yea sainted, in her books, while condemned in His. According to the words of Eck at Leipzig, that the Church militant has been set up in the likeness of the Church triumphant, she has been high in honour with that world which cast the Lord Jesus out. She has divided and judged among those among whom He would do neither. Instead of wearing sackcloth, and having her adorning within, she has, as she best could, anticipated with earthly elements the future glory, and enlisted into her service the creation tainted with the curse and not yet purged by fire. She has Judaized instead of pressing to the mark. She has *descended* to rule the world that is, instead of aspiring to rule that to come. And of the Church, as of the blessed Virgin, it may be said, that, in honouring the mother, the fruit of the womb has been forgotten, of whose relation to earthly glory it has been well said, that while to Paul He outshone the natural sun, His crown and purple robe were the gift of His murderers. Manhood, honesty, duty, and natural affection have been immolated on the altar of God. Priests arm with spiritual sanction their own words and acts ; but when these are questioned the Church disavows them. While she takes the credit of all their services, she takes the burden of none of their errors. She never hazards in their persons, or perils in their acts, that infallibility which they claim for her. She allows men to be put to death for rejecting that to which she will not stand ; and, under the plea of being all things to all men, she will, till they are caught, insist on nothing. She ignores with the martyr's look of an insulted

mother, as pure hallucinations of slandering men, the t^r laid to her charge. Yet as the wicked most fears his^{ings} conscience, so does she her own canons. In permi^{atre} within her pale—yea, in her highest dignitaries—the m^{ng}, various heresies and flagrant immoralities, she confesses that with omniscience to determine she has no omnipotence to effect the truth; and, while infallible in doctrine, has utterly failed in discipline. And, provided men would bow implicitly to her system, she has always allowed them to vent their spleen in private against the details of its operations. Her measure of sin has been its peril to the Church, not its dishonour to the Lord. Having grieved away the Spirit of Christ, she has become a stronghold of wickedness; for as there is nothing so holy as the Church while she holds the Head, so there is nothing so unholy when she lets Him go, and nothing so polluting to the whole course of nature when, having done so, she usurps His place. Had the Reformers been commissioned of God to cleanse and rebuild His temple, and invested with Apostolic power to govern the whole Christian Church (an element of true reformation for which few inquire), the three conditions of reformation stated by Ullman—the pressure of abuses, the demand for their remedy, and the elements of recovery—were abundantly evident. The unparalleled rapidity with which the Reformation spread, so as to carry the testimony of Luther against Indulgences in one month throughout all Christendom, is a proof that all Christendom waited as tinder for the spark, be it the venal Tetzel or the wilful Henry VIII. And whatever mockeries of reformation Satan may have wrought before or after the time of Luther—whatever schisms and heresies then found scope to work—whatever barrenness of doctrine, profanation of worship, and decay of discipline succeeded—doubt there can be none, that the Reformation was, in its essence, a work of God, and that its evils are directly chargeable on those who provoked God and man to so strange a work. By it were vindicated what the Romish cardinal denied: the exclusive mediatorship and merits of Christ; the necessity of faith in the recipient, not indeed to the essence, but to the efficacy, of every divine ordinance for blessing; and the true place of holiness as the fruit of faith. By it a mirror was held up to the Papacy, in which she might have seen and loathed herself. Nay, by it, though in many respects of a retrograde character, preparation was made for an advance towards the kingdom of God, which the

defecacy, had it reformed itself as a body separate from the accie of the Christian Church, could never have made. No to lin can wash polluted water: the vessel must be emptied, ofnd filled with that which is pure. "Wo Saufen eine Ehre ist, da ist Speygen keine Schande:"—where drunkenness is honoured, vomiting is no shame. Truth does not always lie with the many; and it does not always lie with those commissioned to keep and teach it, although we are bound in faith and obedience to expect it at their hands. It sounds much in order to talk of the duty of the Reformers to wait till the Pope and Council undertook ecclesiastical reform; and perhaps they did lack patience: but the Pope and Council would not do so—they themselves were the great offenders. And with all the subversion of God's order and obliteration of God's truth—with all the hasty, unbidden exercise of ecclesiastical functions, and degradation of them to the rank of civil institutions, which accompanied the Reformation,—it cannot be regarded as a gratuitous act of violence done to a divine system in wholesome operation, but rather as an extraordinary remedy for a state of things which should never have been. The apparently lawless acts of the Old Testament prophets were not models for imitation, but God's testimony that the things which they reprovod were altogether out of course. And as every reformation must take things where it finds them, no divine restoration of the Church from disorder into order can ever begin in an orderly way, and start at once on the perfect method of God. A temporary divulsion from things defiled and abused may be the best way both to get wholly quit of their pollution, and so to feel the want as to recover the blessing of their pure administration. They who, being destitute, acquire by faith, will faster hold and better use what they have, than those who merely retain it by force of prejudice. It cannot be doubted that the Papist, who asserts the government of Christ's Church by priests, holds essentially a principle which the kingdom to come shall establish and realize; and that the Protestant, who asserts the ecclesiastical rule by kings or congregations, holds essentially a principle which the kingdom to come shall overthrow and condemn. Yet the Protestant who does recover what he has lost, is more fit to proceed unto perfection than the Papist who perverts the truth. While God chose Judah and not Ephraim, He yet preferred Ephraim to Manasseh. Although He cannot work among the lawless, however prosperous their religion may seem, still His ways are often most accepted among

those who have for a time forgotten them. And it is well worthy of remark, that the hope to see the "government of the Church Universal in the right way," as our Liturgy expresses it, by the grace of God in restoring the apostolic office, has been chiefly revived among Protestants. In this sense, and not as regarding the ecclesiastical institutions of Protestant Europe as the right ones, one can agree with Ullman, when he says of the Reformation, that it was "ein durch unvermeidliches Zerstoren hindurchgehendes Bauen:" a process of building proceeding throughout by unavoidable destruction.

But though the Reformation was a real good, one cannot regard it as being *the* good which God intended. In their fond idolatry of the Reformation, men have compared the chapel at Wittemberg, 20 feet by 30, where Luther preached, to the Tabernacle of old, and to the manger where the infant Jesus lay. But Luther himself never formed the exaggerated estimate of his work which his countrymen betray—he uttered a mere protest against unscriptural doctrine and palpable iniquity. And although forced by circumstances partly to assume a place of direction, and partly to sanction the direction of the Church by the civil power, he left as a legacy to others the work of bringing out the true government and perfection of the Church. Indeed, from the nature of the case, it could not be otherwise, for the limits of every reformation are determined by its cause. And it was not the longing for perfection which caused the Reformation. Protestantism is in its essence the rejection of a judgment, on the ground of its being not founded on reason and justice. In one view it is that out of which Rationalism springs—it asks for reasons. The Reformation implied an appeal from the present judgment of the highest court on earth to the future judgment of the court of heaven. But it bore little trace of a divine preparation for that future judgment. Molitor has well said of it, "The Reformation remained incomplete in neither restoring the Church to her pure primitive condition, nor spiritualizing (*vergeistern*) her existing state." And Oster speaks the same feeling in saying, "Church, according to the New Testament design, the Lutheran Church never entirely was." The very fact that all Reformed Churches bear the names of Luther and Calvin, Sweden and England, Methodist and Independent—down even to the "Stilling's freunden," who put Stilling in the place of Jesus—the fact that they bear the names of men, places, and systems, instead of the name of Christ—

the fact that the hope of His return was not the pole-star, and the fulness of the Holy Ghost in all His gifts the strength, of the Reformers—is conclusive against the claim of the Reformation to be esteemed a catholic and consummating work. None but those stereotypes of truth, Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Alt-Lutheraners, think so. The Greek Church, indeed, says of the Reformers, “How advantageous for Protestants and for the world if, when they fled from the stepmother, they had come to the arms of the mother!” But this would not have done. To be Greek is not to be Catholic. The Reformation was, indeed, no invention of a new faith, as the Romanists falsely say. On the contrary, it vindicated and adopted the ancient and to the end unchangeable faith contained in the three Creeds of the Church. But although it redeemed its own character in doing so, it did not accomplish that which the time demanded—namely, while holding fast the common faith, to carry on the Church to perfection. There is hardly one Roman Catholic error which is not the perversion of a deep and precious truth, looking, and, what is worse, working, like a lie. Much of such perverted truth the Reformers did not redeem, but reject. In the words of Novalis, himself a Romanist—“They asserted many right principles, introduced many praiseworthy things, and abolished many corrupting traditions.” But there the thing rested. The germinating power of divine authority and mission—the Apostolic grace which shall not carry the Church back, but lead her on—was lacking. The hope of Christ’s second coming, which has been the pretext of many counterfeits, just because it is the mark of every true revival, was as little found among the Reformers as since among Moravians or Methodists. They reprimed rather than revived and advanced the Church; and, instead of going on to perfection, they have ever since boasted in that on which they have retreated. Had they done right, they would have built, on the foundation of the primitive faith, a living superstructure worthy of it, and suited to the time. But the true reason of their failure was not so much any sin in them, as that, although witnesses of God against evil, they had no commission to build and set in order the Church, and could not therefore compass a higher work, to which none but Apostles, men divinely commissioned to rule and bless the whole body, are competent, in revising the actings of the Church while destitute of Apostolic guidance, in separating between the precious and the vile, and in preparing the Church as a chaste yet

adorned bride for the return of Christ. As it is, the pious Roman Catholic, whose mingled feelings of grief at the Romish abuse of divine ordinances and of abhorrence at their usurpation by Protestant heretics are too little entered into, cannot possibly find, either in the barren propositions or in the meagre institutions of the Protestant Churches, any trace of many things which his conscience requires, which holy Scripture sanctions, and the constant custom of the Church recommends. That Luther, unlike Zuingle and many others, was essentially conservative, and destructive only by constraint, is plain from his short answer to Carlstadt, to whose question—"Where has Christ commanded to elevate the host?"—he replied, "Where has He forbidden it?" But, like all who bid adieu to accustomed routes, the Protestants lost themselves in the mists of uncertainty; and, not having the divine safeguard of Apostolic wisdom and authority, thought it safest wholly to reject that wherein, while they felt it to be mixed with evil, they could not discriminate, although, in the fall of the edifice, now this, now that portion was by chance left standing. Their just abhorrence of the things from which they had escaped laid them open to opposite dangers. And had it not been that God caused a holy fear to come over the bold heart of Luther, whereby, at the expense of many inconsistencies, he stopped short of those evil consequences to which consistency in error would have led him, there is no saying into what extravagances Protestantism might have run. It is well known how the ungodliness of many Protestants, who hailed the Reformation as a manumission of their trammelled lusts, vexed the righteous souls of the Reformers—how Luther's wife mourned the coldness of her prayers—and how Luther himself, in 1533, complained that the people were more wicked than before, and, like bishops and princes, had utterly disappointed his hope to see a holy seed among men. The boasted theological ignorance of novices opened the door to ridicule on the one hand, and heresy on the other; and the fulminations bandied about by those who had no divine authority in doctrine and discipline over each other, were of no avail to arrest either the anabaptist delusions or the peasant war. Liberty and licence are as opposed as rest and sloth.

This is not the place to consider in detail either the corruptions of the Greeks and Roman Catholics, or the defects of the Protestant bodies. But it may be well to contemplate a few of the leading particulars in which Pro-

testant Churches, especially the German, have suffered loss. And in order the more profitably to do so, one requires to take a short review of the original constitution and subsequent history of the Christian Church.

It is clear that the Lord, both before His death and after His resurrection, gave to His Apostles *alone* the *immediate* commission to continue His work upon the earth; and that all divine authority in the Church has been imparted to her only *mediately*, and that through Apostles, from the Lord. To the Apostles did the Lord first give the commission to preach the Gospel to every creature, to teach all nations, to baptize all nations, to celebrate the Lord's Supper, to forgive sins and to retain them, to communicate the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands to those who believed and were baptized, to consecrate to office in the Church, to administer discipline, to set in order and conduct public worship, to be witnesses of His resurrection and fosterers of the hope of His return, to preserve the unity of the Church, and to prepare her as a bride for His coming. And, consequently, we find that the first picture of the Church given to us by the Holy Ghost in the Book of the Acts points to the Apostles as being under the Lord Himself the fountains of doctrine and ministry, the foundation and manifestation of unity—"They continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.) And the Apostle John declares expressly that the Church could only *mediately*—viz., through Apostles—attain to that fulness of divine communion which the Apostles already enjoyed. In the name of his fellow-apostles he addresses the brethren (not the heathen) in these words—"That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ."

The Church was in the beginning founded by her glorified Head as a perfect whole, but not as a perfectly developed whole. God fixed her constitution, but circumstances regulated its development. That which was gradually evolved through the spiritual wants of the saints was at once the realization of the eternal counsel of God, and the thing best adapted to the circumstances of men. In spite of his fallen state, man exhibits a fourfold capacity for both the exercise and the acknowledgment of divine authority—for the impartation and reception of supernatural light, for the exhibition and appreciation of God's mercy, for the

manifestation and experience of Christ's tender care. In these four ways he acts, and is acted upon. And we read that the Lord, who ascended up far above all heavens that He might fill all things, gave gifts to men (these gifts being themselves men, who, by this, became gifts from the Lord to their brethren), and that He set them through His commission and His grace to be apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, in order that, as of old through the cherubim, He might reveal His glory, and that, as by the rivers of Eden, He might water the garden of His Church. He gave them "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ;" and because it is said *till* ($\mu\epsilon\chi\rho\iota$) we "all come," &c., it is clear that these ordinances of the Church are designed for all times, and that they are God's own appointed means or instruments whereby we should attain to "the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Through them should the saints be preserved in the assurance of faith and in the ways of righteousness, and attain to that which is set before them as members of one body. Through them, too (v. 14), should "we be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;" but, on the contrary, should we, while "speaking the truth in love, grow up unto him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ." Through these divine ordinances alone can the many members of the one body be duly compacted and held together. Through them alone can that body attain its organic perfection, increase in the power of life and love, possess a truly catholic and enduring constitution, and truly expect the Head.

But for this very reason, too, that it is the mind of God to accomplish through a diversity of gifts His work in the Church, we find the Apostles led by the spiritual necessities of the Church to devolve upon those brethren whom they judged fit for the charge, the greater part of those duties which were originally performed by themselves. In the first place they acknowledged the grace of God that dwelt in all the members of the Church, by calling on them to choose those who should be set apart to the office of deacon—"men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," and who were thus especially fitted to manifest brotherly love, and give the world a testimony to the

blessing of God upon His children. In the next place the Apostles attested the capability of the believers, in general, to administer spiritual functions in the Church, in that they ordained (consecrated) to various offices in the particular churches, after probation, those who had been already presented by the Church, and called by the voice of the Holy Ghost (Acts xiii. 2; xiv. 23; xx. 28; 2 Tim. i. 6). To Angels, with their elders in the various churches, they committed the government of those churches respectively (Rev. ii. 2; 1 Peter v. 5). And they committed to prophets the revelation of the mysteries of the written Word, the comforting and warning of the saints, and the immediate explication of the bearings of things present and future upon the interests of the kingdom of God (Acts xiii. 1; 2 Peter i. 20; 2. Cor. xiv. 3; Acts xv. 32; ii. 25-30; xx. 23; xxi. 10); to evangelists the preaching of the Gospel, and the reception of the converted into the Church by baptism (Acts viii. 5, in connection with xxi. 8); to pastors and teachers the cure of souls, the offices of prayer, and the instruction of the faithful.

By means of this devolution of spiritual functions were the Apostles gradually set free from the immediate charge of particular churches, in order to devote themselves exclusively to the superintendence of the whole Church, and the strengthening and instructing of all the ministers of Christ. And even in this work, from a consciousness of their insufficiency alone to bear the whole load of this superintendence, they associated with themselves, as counsellors and helps in the management of the whole Church, such of the clergy as had been faithful in their offices in particular churches, and were of sufficient spiritual growth to apprehend and fulfil the counsel of God, in regard to all the churches of the saints, as the several parts of one organic whole (Eph. vi. 21; Phil. iv. 3; Philem. 24; 1 Thess. i. 1; iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. ii. 2; iv. 9; Tit. i. 5). When questions arose of special difficulty or of universal interest, the Apostles called together not the clergy only, but laymen also—either in person or represented by deacons—to deliberate and give counsel in the matter. Such a council was that of Jerusalem (Acts xv.). And it is worthy of remark that those there assembled did not decide the questions brought before them by a majority of votes, but stood as counsellors, in the proper sense, to the Apostles. The latter presided; and, as the rulers of the Church, they gave judgment and exercised

government in the light of the counsel there sought and given.

Thus, not through the will or wisdom of man, but through the will and the wisdom of God, arose the constitution of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. There is no name without meaning. Human appellations express human conceptions—divine names the realities of God. The first Adam, in giving names to the creatures, spake according to the appearance; the names given by the second Adam express the essence of things. And so the definition which from the beginning has been applied by all to the Church, regards not her appearance at any given time, but what she is eternally in the eye of God. She is one, not only because her members are united in thought, word, and work; but because she proceeds from the One Head, and is destined to be His fulness. Holy, not only on account of her good works, but because she is elected of God and consecrated to Him in Christ. Catholic, not only because extended over the earth, but because designed in the counsel of God to be the fountain of His blessing for all men. Apostolic, not only because she once had Apostles, or still has their successors and their doctrine, but because she is sent into the world by Christ as He was sent by the Father, and should ever have in the midst of her men sent forth of God and Christ.

The authority which the Lord gave to His Apostles was a universal one, for it embraced the whole Church (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). And while all subordinate ministries were unlimited in number, the Apostles were limited to twelve. Every other servant of the Lord derived his authority through the Apostles, and exercised it for a specific work, or within a limited sphere. The Angels and their elders were limited to their special churches; the helps to the Apostles—such as Timothy and Titus—did the specific work prescribed to them from time to time by the Apostles. No patriarch or bishop, no council or majority of bishops, could take that place in the Church which the Lord assigned to His Apostles. When, through the failure of faith and hope in the Church, the vacancies in the Apostolic body remained unfilled, and the whole twelve, instead of continuing as a permanent ordinance, ultimately disappeared, the Church, deprived of prelates who ruled by immediate commission from her divine Head, was no longer comprehended under one jurisdiction—had no longer the proper presidents of her councils—was deprived of her chief ordinance for the

exercise of spiritual wisdom—lost the fulness of the Holy Ghost—and saw all her ministries either crippled by the want of Apostolic support, or confounded and disturbed by the want of Apostolic control. In losing Apostles she lost her main security for keeping the ways of the Lord, and came into an imperfect condition, which a perfect legislation would not suit. All the acts of the Church, since Apostles ceased, have been necessarily defective at the best; and all measures for her guidance, without Apostles, must necessarily be found more or less inapplicable to her proper Apostolic condition, because they have been devised for her while in a mutilated state. Hence the value of an appeal to ecclesiastical canons and traditions is vastly inferior to what it would have been had Apostles continued in the Church. The presence or absence of Apostles is not a mere collateral circumstance, but essentially affects the state and capacities of the Christian polity.

Had the Apostolic ministry continued in the Church, as it appeared in the beginning, the position of the Church as regards the State would have undergone no change through the conversion of the temporal rulers. Each member of the Church, including of course the Apostles, owed his worldly ruler allegiance, fidelity, and obedience in everything relating to this world, even though the ruler were still a heathen; for the ordinances of this world, political and domestic, although sanctified and strengthened in the Church, have not their origin there. And as the king, by becoming a Christian, is in no respect limited in his worldly power and independence, so the Church, through his reception within her pale, is unaffected in her spiritual government. Over all things earthly ranges the authority of the king; the Church, however, is super-terrestrial in her origin, in her constitution, in her destination. Over these his power extends not, for he is not called of the Lord to rule in heavenly things.

Had the government of the world been shared by several rulers, their conversion, even in the event of no Apostle continuing in the Church, would not have operated so easily to the subjugation of the Church by the temporal power; for, while the rulers were independent of and separate from each other, had but the bishops of all nations drawn together, no one of the former could have usurped authority over the whole body of the latter.

The fact was, however, that, on the disappearance of Apostles, the bishops, who had no universal commission,

and whose authority was limited to their respective dioceses, stood over against a universal earthly jurisdiction, in one whose power extended itself over the whole civilized world. The influence of his conversion upon the position of the Church is hence only too easily explicable. The head already universally recognized in worldly things stood ready to assume universal spiritual jurisdiction. Constantine, not only a layman, but unbaptized—one, who, though he believed in Christ, was yet no member of His Church—this Constantine, although with real or apparent humility, took the presidency in the Council of Nice, and instructed the bishops how they should treat the ecclesiastical questions before them; so that while he lived he asserted that place of *ισαποστολος* which on his death-bed he desired to hold in the memory of the Church. This he did not of himself, but at the urgent solicitation of the bishops; and the blame was theirs. As the priesthood, while faithful, are the true channel of God's blessing to the Church, and through her to the world, so, when faithless, are they the root of all evil in the Church, and through her, in the world. Such a request from bishops to an unbaptized emperor can be only regarded as a judgment of God upon the Church for her departure from her original constitution. Had she kept her first love, and the living hope of the Lord's return, He would have preserved to her the Apostolic office by which He exercises His universal spiritual government, and she would have had no occasion to turn to the civil ruler. But when, relinquishing that hope, she allowed her members to sink under the power of death, and sought a permanent abode on earth, she became subjected to a rule which was the counterpart of her degraded spirit.

The Roman Empire was a unity; hence the Church preserved, even after her subjugation, the appearance of unity. But the basis of her unity was a new one. She rested on the unity of an earthly and not a heavenly constitution: and since unity can be maintained only by the principle from which it proceeds, and not by the mere fact of its existence, the unity of the Church could not long survive its true basis. Had the Church, in spite of internal strife, error, and abuse, been extended through many different countries in her integrity as a heavenly institution, her unity would have been a lasting one; but when she ranked with an earthly unity, its destruction inferred the destruction of hers also. The schism between the Greek and Roman Churches was preceded by the division

between the Greek and Roman Empires. On the overthrow of those empires, which had usurped the spiritual rule of Apostles, there remained no visible head, spiritual or civil, as the bond and centre of ecclesiastical unity. And had not the Papacy arisen, to preserve the memory of Apostolic government, the Churches in the different nations of Europe would have at once taken rank as national Churches, each under its own temporal head, who, as the father of his people, would have taken on him the care of their highest interests, and amalgamated ecclesiastical with other national affairs. The consciousness to the need of a universal ecclesiastical government yet survived in the Church; and the partition of the civil power fostered that consciousness. As the intrusion of the Emperor into the Church had preserved her from internal divisions, so the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome preserved her from becoming altogether worldly. But for this, individual Christians might, indeed, have remembered their heavenly calling; but the Church would have assuredly forgotten hers.

Where the king and the priest keep their own relative places, they cannot conflict. Both are God's ordinances. But where either exercises an unlawful power, and gets into a false position, they must clash; and that often the more, the more sincerely they act. This contest can be traced through the whole history of Christendom. Church and State should be bound together, but not mingled. It is right to assert their mutual independence, but it is wrong to seek their separation. For where the temporal ruler is a member of the Church, he must fulfil his duties in the light of the Christian faith; and his right instruction is the more important, that his conscientious errors are so widely injurious where he is uninstructed. As the father in the family, so is the king in the kingdom the supreme authority. Although all members of the Church are, as such, subject to their pastors, they are not so as heads of families or kingdoms. Secular distinctions in the Church and ecclesiastical distinction in the State mutually provoke and punish each other. The king, though anointed by the priest, is not vassal; his throne was in the world before the Church. Neither is he, as king, responsible to the priest; he derives his sword as little as his throne from Peter. But, on the other hand, the wisest and holiest king is no ordinance of God for ruling the Church. Alas! the chief protest against his doing so has been by those priests who sought to rule him, and whose ambition he checked; and the Church has

become so unspiritual as to feel no inconvenience under temporal rule. But these considerations do not diminish either the injustice or the injury of intrusion by the king. No doubt the Church does not consist of the clergy alone; yet the German division of the Church into clergy, king, and people is radically unsound. Some members of a family may be soldiers, some merchants; but no one would think of dividing that family into parents, soldiers, merchants, and children. Why, then, is the Church divided into clergy, king, and people, as if the king were not of the people? Or, if so, why not enumerate all other social distinctions? The temporal ruler has a place in the Church as a man, but none as a king, either over or under the clergy. The priest has his place as a subject in the kingdom, but none as a priest either over or under the king. The king may, at the head of his people, as a father at the head of his family, call on God's name, confess their common sins, and acknowledge their common blessings. He may stir up to national godliness, plead the righteous cause, punish blasphemy, and defend the truth when assailed in his person. His blessing in the Church will be large in proportion to the number whom he has to bless. But ruler or father of the Church he is not. He has no priestly function—he does not impart the Holy Ghost. He shall have no account to give of ecclesiastical government.

The history of the Church before the Reformation furnishes examples enough of the departure of the Romish Church from her own principles, in her concordats, by which she has come half way to meet pragmatic sanctions, oftener from ambition or fear than from wise discernment of national diversities. The Greek Church, so prominent in the acknowledgment of civil rule over the Church, has long smarted for her unfaithfulness. One part groans under the successors of Mohammed; another, though professedly under the Patriarch of Constantinople, is governed by a Roman Catholic king according to Protestant rules; a third, arbitrarily separated from brethren acknowledged as orthodox, in order to form a mere national institution, lies asleep under the lifeless administration of a holy synod, which pretends to have inherited the fifth patriarchate forfeited by Rome. In the Protestant Churches of the Continent—be their constitution episcopal, territorial, or collegiate—the civil ruler is, in fact, the head of the Church. The clergy are his servants, deriving from him their authority, and to him responsible. It matters not whether he rests his claim on

his dominion of the soil, or on the devolution of episcopacy upon him, on his right *in sacra*, or his right *circa sacra*. It matters not whether he exercises his ecclesiastical government personally or by others, through clergy or through laity, or through a board composed of both; he may mean well—may do good; but, as his only calling is to temporal government, and that over his own dominions, he cannot bring the Church to her heavenly and universal perfection. A mere national Church cannot receive divine institutions which embrace men of all nations. National Churches may all *resemble* each other, but they cannot form a *unity*. Co-operate they may, but they cannot be *incorporate*. Neither Luther, nor the devout princes of his day on whose help he was cast, dreamt of edifying the Catholic Church as one body.

In England, where episcopacy retained till of late somewhat of its true dignity, the political oaths of the clergy, nevertheless, clearly indicate the position of the king, as occupying in the Anglican Church that visible headship which Apostles should occupy in the Catholic Church. The election of the bishops is, in fact, in his hands. King and Parliament can dictate, alter, and abolish the faith and discipline of the Church. The tenure of the British Crown is essentially schismatic, and must conflict with the king's acknowledgment of all Christian Churches. The king of England must be of a faith opposed to that of Rome. He must maintain Anglican episcopacy against Rome. He cannot acknowledge Apostolic authority embracing both. He dares no more let Paul than the Pope name English bishops who shall be peers of Parliament. Every ecclesiastical authority, not pertaining to the realm of England, is expressly rejected by statute—though it were that of Paul himself. No English clergyman dare attend a general council without the king's authority. Ecclesiastical offences both against the ritual and otherwise are coupled with civil and criminal sanctions,—with suspension, deprivation, and imprisonment,—by Act of Parliament. The Church of England, in her joy at escaping a foreign jurisdiction, seems to have forgotten that a domestic power may also transgress its natural limits; and in the same proportion in which the king allows the bishops independent action, are they without any unity of action. The name of the king precedes those of the bishops in the liturgy. And late Acts of Parliament have struck deep, successive blows at the independence of the Church. She needs only to move to feel her chains.

The Scottish Church conceived, at the time of her recognition by the State, that she had asserted her entire independence. In many things, especially in her assemblies she is free. But late events have proved too clearly that she is not exempt from the subjugation common to all Protestant Churches. Even supposing that the principles advocated against patronage (some so just and some so erroneous) were all right, they are still at variance with the express conditions on which the Scottish Church was recognized by the State. By these conditions the right of patronage, although limited to the appointment of those approved by the Church, subsists—a right alike contrary to God's way, whether patronage be viewed as belonging to an individual, or as devolved on one of the congregation by the rest; for to the congregation belongs the acceptance, but not the choice, of the candidate. The Scottish Church, while asserting that Jesus is the only King in Zion, refuses His whole machinery of rule. The English, acknowledging in part His means of government, allows an earthly king to be her head.

But, in addition to the mutual usurpations of the clergy and of the civil power, a third evil appeared, which the Reformation greatly helped to develop. The inferior clergy then stood opposed to bishops who resisted reform, and the laity often on a like ground to the clergy. The deserted sheep were almost constrained to be their own guides. Laymen distinguished for piety, scriptural knowledge, and other such qualities, were betrayed into the unauthorized exercise of clerical functions by the exigencies of the time. And, without looking either at the fleshly licentiousness into which the ungodly perverted their new liberty, or at the retributions of the vindictive, it is plain that the most faithful of the Reformers too often missed the narrow way of *spiritual obedience*. Dissevered from a unity of death, they sought life at the expense of those divine institutions which should have inspired it; and in their zeal to hold fast the Head in heaven, they too often spurned the ministry of His servants on earth. No doubt the national ecclesiastical institutions consequent upon the Reformation set limits of one kind to this spiritual independence; but the evil itself survived, untouched by them. And as godliness decayed, it grew apace, until brought by recent events into ripeness and predominance. The precious truth, that every one baptized into Christ stands in immediate connection with Him, has been too often abused to

sanction the rejection of every human interposition in the worship and edification of the saints. The no less precious truth, that we all are brethren in Christ, has been pleaded as a ground for rejecting every divine gradation of office in the Church, and reducing all diversity of ministers to mere human arrangement. The truths that whatsoever is not of faith is sin, and that all which does not agree with Holy Writ is false, have been employed to excuse the breach or non-fulfilment of God's commandments, to justify arbitrary courses, and to exclude every view but one of scriptural truth. They who pass for spiritual people have been accustomed to yield no deference to ministers whom they count unspiritual. Too many, associating godliness with nothing but prayer-meetings and religious conversation, have, instead of fulfilling their daily duties, spurned them as carnal and distracting to devotion. In self-imagined purity, they have separated themselves from the ordinances under which the vulgar herd of Christians are placed. Under the plea of returning to Gospel simplicity, they have constructed out of the Bible a one-sided, narrow-hearted system of their own, which claims no kindred whatever with that which the Holy Ghost has from the beginning taught, and the Church has ever held fast. In asserting the invisible unity of the saints, they have contended against every divine appointment for its visible expression; and feverish partialities or false liberality have supplanted that true love of the brotherhood which rests on the faith of our common baptism.

Such ecclesiastical errors have been inevitably followed by their counterparts in political, social, and domestic life. The just authority of king, master, husband, and father has been sacrificed at the shrine of religious conscience. Each, refusing to be led by any but God, really leads himself. Refusing the judgment of man, as he says, he erects himself as the judge of all around and above him. And he would thus reduce mankind to a congeries of atoms, linked together by no divine order or law, but connected by chance, or elective attractions. The first French Revolution might have served to show how such principles must issue. The civil institutions which rose on the ruins of old Rome, with all their defects, eminently expressed and favoured the development of the truth. And it is more than doubtful whether politico-religious theories which strike at, or sap, what remains of these institutions, are to be regarded as fruits of a higher illumination or greater spiritual maturity than that of our fathers. Republican States, like religious conven-

ticles, have always existed ; but, while of old they arose where Monarchy had been untried, where Christianity was unknown, or where persecution or search of gain had brought men together, now they appear as intentional exponents of the settled principle that the will of the governed is supreme, and as substitutes for legitimate authority deliberately rejected. Great as has been the abuse of power, its merciful exercise was formerly always welcome. But now no more is needed than the fact that a government is not sprung from the governed to make it the object of secret grudge or open hostility to men with whom the mere sense of subjection is intolerable—who, pure in their own eyes, lay all iniquity bare, and, having no patience to wait for the righteous judge, bring everything, not to the light of God, but to the light of public opinion.

These political movements of the time have operated reflexly upon the Church. The many religious societies which the newly-awakened zeal of Christians has called forth within the last fifty years, however praiseworthy their objects and beneficial their operations, all bear the stamp of democratic institutions. Their constitution is the fruit of man's will and man's combination—their managers are of popular election—and the voice of a majority is the last resort. They exist only as a rebuke to the Church, and an excrescence on the body ecclesiastical ; and they have tended not a little to wean the affections of the faithful from ecclesiastical institutions of divine sanction, which, although through lukewarmness become inoperative, would, when zealously administered, be the fit instrument for doing God's work in God's way. The desire common to the godly and the ungodly for the separation of Church and State expresses a paradoxical sympathy between the two classes—the one seeking to be no longer disturbed in their worldliness by the Church, and the other seeking liberation from all constraint in their religious occupations. And who does not feel that the fondness of men for such theories as that of universal priesthood, betrays their desire to derive and direct all power from beneath ? Tyranny and partiality in the administration of God's ordinances have had their day. Lawlessness under the form of law—in other words, the exchange of divine institutions for human substitutes—the effort of man, soon peradventure by help from beneath, to fabricate for himself something better than the worn-out blessing and guidance of Christ—now prevails in every

department of life. In Church and State alike, power from beneath is worshipped like the rising sun; and in promising themselves liberty, mankind now pioneer the way for the king over the children of pride. A fountain of grace, true or false, men must have; and it has ever been sought for in a lower and lower place. In the beginning the ministers of Christ looked for authority and grace from heaven. Thereafter they sought them in high places of the earth. Now they seek them in the lower. Shall they at length descend to take them from beneath? The Church has been subdivided, but not enlarged. Her variety is the patchwork of poverty—not the ornament of wealth. Her activity is the exorbitance of distortion—not the working of a well hung frame. And, as a mighty river, running its undivided course, is at length subdivided and half absorbed by the obstruction of its own sediment, so have the admixtures of evil in the Christian Church occasioned the breach of its unity, so have its many sections since run their enfeebled course as polluted as the parent stream.

This short sketch of the history and present position of the Church admits of many exceptions. But these only prove the rule. Its features are modified by circumstances, but its essentials may be verified throughout. In Germany the name of Luther is remembered, but the heirloom of truth retained or recovered by him is little prized. An invisible Church composed of a universal priesthood, founded on an impersonal word, and cemented with love, has long been the fourfold object of the pious German's idolatry. But now questions force themselves upon him which its responses will not solve; and God is raising up a body of faithful men, who will not be any longer put off with such unscriptural, intangible, and empty fictions as have hitherto satisfied the requirements of pietists, and who will be the first to feel how much Protestants have lost. That loss we shall now shortly state.

In the first place, as it was the prostration of man's reason and will that constituted one great evil of the Papal system, so it was in the right exercise of man's reason and will that the deliverance was to be seen. But the liberty to be truly vindicated was the liberty to follow God, not to guide ourselves to understand, not to judge the truth—to use the conscience in responding to the law of God, not to worship and obey the conscience instead of God—to profit intelligently by the traditions and judg-

ment of the Holy Ghost in the Church, not to trust each his own heart in contempt thereof: in short, to accept in the freedom of a son the guidance of Christ, exercised, as it always should be, through His ordinances, and with the assent of His Church. In restoring liberty to the Church and religion to society, the reason of man, spoiled by its own success, found too good a plea for refusing control; and, having rejected the Papal usurpation, found an equal ground for withstanding all ecclesiastical authority in the faith. Conscience, so long violated, now became that, before the dictates and for the integrity of which each individual sacrificed without scruple or misgiving the conscience and unity of the Church. Man was encouraged by the very goodness of his cause in that natural pride which works alike in the scowling discontent of the Radical and the intolerant sanctity of the Schismatic. And with the destruction of superstition kept pace that lawlessness of which the Press seems a necessary condition, and which, in spite of the wholesome check resulting from the infusion of military discipline into German Church government, gains strength every day. In this aspect it is not too much to say, that the Reformation, if it was the grave of one Antichrist, was also the cradle of another. They who are guided *may* be led astray, but they who guide themselves *must* err.

In the next place, the subjection of the Church to the State—a just judgment on the former for her interference in the affairs of this world—almost unavoidably flowed out of the protection afforded by the latter. For although Luther, in turning for aid to the German princes, boldly asserted the independence of the preacher and his duty to admonish all alike, yet the Church had not that measure of faith which could lift her above worldly categories. Apostles, the true witnesses for Christ's ascension and return, appointed of Him to impart His Spirit, to show forth His example, and to give His commandments to the whole Church, should always have continued her visible head, until by their ministry she attained her perfection. Till they are restored she must, unless a mere idol-led democracy, be governed either by episcopal councils, by popes, or by civil rulers. Councils, from which Apostles should have derived help in ruling the Church, and by which Apostolic tradition was in a measure preserved, fell into strife and error when they undertook to rule. The Papacy, which long singly vindicated the proper indepen-

dence of the Church, became itself the just object of offence; and the Church, subdivided and deserted, had no visible alternative left, but to submit in each land to the civil power, and content herself with an earthly and national, instead of a heavenly and Catholic existence. The deeper interest the Protestant prince took in her prosperity, the more was he tempted to exercise that care which her dignitaries had renounced. Legal fictions helped him, without intending evil, to lay his earthly hand on the heavenly tabernacle; and he soon became, with even less right than the Pope, the head of the Church, each in his own dominions. Indeed, among those who, as members of the Church, cannot trust Christ's ministers to act without control from beneath, it is quite unreasonable to expect that a king should leave them unfettered. However well individuals may fare in personal religion, the German Church, as a body, has long known no fountain of grace save the civil ruler. He is in title and in fact her "*summus episcopus*;" and she has quietly taken her place with education and medicine, as one of three institutions for the good of spirit, soul, and body, among the departments of civil government. Royal escutcheons and full-length portraits of heroes and statesmen arrest the eye where more sacred emblems and images would once have found a place; and pulpit performances on holidays new in the calendar take rank with theatrical entertainments and military reviews, as parts of royal or civic pageantry. The Church of each nation can look no higher than the ruler, and have no unity wider than the limits, of the nation. And where the king employs ecclesiastics instead of laymen to carry out *his* ecclesiastical rule, the evil, instead of being lessened, is only aggravated by their misemployment. Consistories, synods, superintendents, and all such instrumentality, are but the machinery which worldly wisdom has created for the exercise of worldly government. Ecclesiastical courts, attempting to guide the Church, exhibit only the confusion of parts, which, if duly compacted under divine guidance, would harmonize. But the time will come when the Holy Ghost, whom no king can dispense, will cause the Church to dwell alone and not be reckoned among the institutions or divided by the national frontiers of the world that is. This feeling now works deep in the breasts of German clergy, whose loyalty to the powers that be in all things civil is unquestioned. Yet the question may well be asked, whether the convictions now so generally expressed, as

to the proper independence of the Church, would in many survive the withdrawal of stipend and countenance by the State.

Thirdly: The difference between the Papal and Protestant definitions of the Church stands, as Ullmann well remarks, in the two following propositions: the Papal, "Where the Church is, there are Christ and the grace of God;" the Protestant, "Where Christ and the grace of God are, there is the Church." Between these there is no real contradiction; they are the two sides of one truth. For as certainly as the ordinances of the Church are the appointed channels for the grace of God and the presence of Christ, so, without the presence of Christ and the grace of God, the ordinances of the Church are worse than useless. The visible Church should be husk and kernel in one. There are not two distinct religions—one to better the heart, and the other to empower the minister. If, then, it be asked, how it comes that two correlatives so essentially united have been divided? it may be asked in reply, how the body of Christ, the Christian Church, essentially one, has been rent by schism into many parts, which, though capable of forming one, now stand mutually opposed? As the members of one body, if divided, are enemies, so the parts of one truth, taken singly, contradict each other. The Protestant professes to contend for the jewel, and despises the setting; but, because that setting is, or should be, as truly divine as the jewel, they who will have the jewel out of the setting cannot keep it. This is abundantly verified by the fact; for how superior soever the Protestant may be to the Papist in intellectual psychology, his spirit, mystically pursuing after a communion with God independent of His appointments, has well-nigh lost all apprehension of Him in the ordinances of the Church, and is hardly conscious of any privileges superior to those of a devout heathen. Baptismal regeneration—that birth *by water* which, if it is not in baptism, is nowhere; that transplanting from the old Adam into the new, on the additional basis of which the Church shall be judged, as all men shall be on the basis of the Gospel; the Eucharistic oblation of, and nourishment with, the Body and Blood of Christ, in the oblation and communion of consecrated bread and wine; the power of Christ's ministers to confer the Holy Ghost by the laying on of their hands, to loose sins and retain them by their word; in short, all real transactions between Christ and the Church through men appointed and creatures set apart by

Him—all blessing in one way which cannot be had in any other as well,—such truths as these are things devoutly eschewed by the spiritual. The mightiest realities of God fluctuate between existence and non-existence with the personal characters of men, and with the varying condition of each. That very Luther, who was in general so staunch as to sacraments, and who could say of the Pope, “I listen to him as Pope when he speaks with the canons, or agreeably to them, or regulates any matter with a council, but not when he speaks of his own mind”—could at another time say, “I can every day enjoy the advantage of the sacraments, if I do but call to mind the word and promise of Christ, and with them feed and strengthen my faith.” As, on the one hand, the quenching of the Spirit led to schism in the Church, like the earth which becomes chapped through drought—so, on the other, the Protestant Churches, exponents of schism, have not the capacity of a whole and entire vessel, to be filled with the manifold treasures of God. Each fragment holds less than its proportion of the whole. And in these Churches baptized men have fallen, in spite of their ever learning, to a lower condition than that of the ancient catechumen. Boasting of simplicity, they perish through poverty; and they well deserve the epithet of him who said, “*Cœtus quærentium non habentium veritatem schola est non ecclesia.*”

Fourthly: The German Protestants have almost entirely lost the faith of Christian priesthood. This was a natural result of their just indignation at the arrogance and crimes of the Romish hierarchy, and was in part compensated by the recovery of the long-forgotten truth that every Christian is, in one sense, a royal priest, privileged to worship God as a son—a truth which every liturgical response implies. Although the principles on which Melancthon and his party offered to recognize the Pope and the hierarchy, if they would effect the desired reform, contained no recognition of divine right in priesthood—and although Luther, while acknowledging that clergy and laity had not the same work to perform, maintained that they belonged to one estate—yet even they might not have rejected the distinction between priest and layman, if the former had not virtually bidden away the latter as profane from full participation in the Christian mysteries, so as to provoke men to reject priesthood in vindicating the proper rights of the laity. But the result has been that, under the cover of one theory or another—whether that of mere convenient and orderly

arrangement, or that of spontaneous and self-adjusting spiritual development, or that of popular election, or that of mere civil appointment—German Protestants hardly anywhere recognize an order of men who, besides their common position as Christians, have their peculiar office as Christian priests—the substance of the Jewish shadow—ministers of Christ, the true Priest of God—and functions of the Lord, not of the Church. Whether, as in Sweden, the Episcopacy still remains as the reward of unsanctified talent and the door to servility; or whether, as in Germany, its place is supplied by the office of superintendent under a Government board; or whether, as among the Calvinists, it has altogether disappeared,—priesthood, as a thing divine, has been rejected by all parties alike.

The Ultra-Calvinists, who, while retaining a faith in divine agency, detach it from every ordinance, as if Christ were not come in flesh, and disallow most acts to which priesthood is necessary, are consistent as compared with the Lutherans, who, while justly binding up divine agency with sacramental acts, and maintaining that none without “due call” may perform these, do not require that due call to be divine, and plead for the anomaly of a divinely-appointed act without a divinely-appointed agent. The Church of England has been honoured to retain the doctrine and name of priesthood; and for this cause she is regarded by continental Romanists as the only link by which Romanists and Protestants can ever be re-united. This apparent honour, however, she mainly owes to the fact that hers was no proper ecclesiastical, but rather a civil reform, effected by the Government, not by the people, and in which, as in Sweden, many good things remained by being let alone. It had for its main object to change her allegiance from the Pope to the King; and so it left everything untouched, save those things which affected in doctrine or discipline the question of Papal supremacy. But it is impossible for priesthood in its essence to survive where civil government practically controls it. Accordingly, we find that the English clergy, although retaining the name, have relinquished too generally the functions of priests in worship and discipline. And the late decision of the Ecclesiastical Court—not protested against by a single bishop—that although there is a place for administration of the Supper to men, *there ought to be no place in the house of God where the Church can offer to Him the memorial of Christ’s death*, is proof enough that our Anglican priests, having lost sight of their primary

function in the Eucharist, can know little of other priestly acts.

Every one knows that the word *priest* is derived from *presbyter*, or *πρεσβυτερος*, which means simply an elder; and that the word *ιερευς*, by us rendered priest, means simply one occupied with sacred things. The original and the translation combined import no more than precedence and rule in one habitually occupied with the things of God's house. How he obtains this place, and what are its duties, are separate questions. The prevalence of priestcraft, through the natural tendency of man to shift responsibility off himself upon any spiritual agent who will transact for him, has naturally excited prejudices against the name of priesthood among many who do not reject the thing. Yet it is to be feared that many do the latter, and that they generally do so from a latent doubt as to the divine commission of Christ's ministers. The most strenuous advocates of universal priesthood—i.e., of the equality of all Christians in place and privilege—admit that ministry must be confined to some; but while willing to see some exclusively entrusted with it by men, they will not allow some to be exclusively entrusted with it by God. They allow the end, but they question the means. Divine selection they call hierarchy, innovation, priestcraft, castship, and usurpation of Christ's priestly office—while to human they make no objection, whether it be brought about by State appointment, by popular vote, by lot, by tacit development, or supposed providence of God. Now, surely, if the division of Christians into those who minister and those who merely attend on the ministry is in itself right, the fact that it is wrought by God and not by man cannot make it wrong. Therefore, the true objection to a Christian priesthood must refer to the investment of some with power common to all. That all Christians, being partakers of the Holy Ghost, have a *capacity* for ministry, cannot be denied. Indeed, that is one ground on which, should the existing priesthood prove faithless, God could consistently call forth another. But from this it does not follow that all Christians have either the *right* or the *power* to minister. And the Scriptures show the reverse. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the perfect manifester of God, always had in Him the fulness of the priestly office; but He was not *made* a high priest till His Resurrection; and His first great act as high priest was to go into the Holiest with His own blood at His Ascension. In the days of His flesh He was a Jew under the law, bound to acknowledge the Levitical

priesthood, and sprung of Judah, which had no claim to priesthood. "If he were on earth, he should not be a priest, seeing there are priests who offer after the law" (Heb. viii. 4). "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek," applies to a priesthood anterior to and independent of, embracing and surviving, the Jewish. "Thou art my Son: this day have I begotten thee," points to the day of Christ's Resurrection, as the day on which He was declared the Son of God with power, and began His high priestly work, which He now at God's right hand carries on in the Church, seated with Him in heavenly places. As He is sole mediator, so is He sole high priest. The Church, enjoying His presence, possesses the only real priesthood—that to which the Jewish, as a mere shadow, did homage, when Levi, in the loins of Abraham, was blessed by Melchisedek. (Heb. vii. 9, 10.) This priestly character Christ imparts to men—in one sense to His whole Church, as of old to all Israel—in another to the clergy alone by spiritual descent, as of old to the Jewish priests by natural. He, as high priest, administers the heavenly things in the Church; and this He does in a fourfold form or manner by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, who carry out the exhibition of His fourfold character to men. As all are not apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers in the Church, so all are not priests; for priests are they who carry out Christ's priesthood; and His priesthood goes forth in these four forms. And as apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers are given by the Lord to the Church, so are priests. While deacons, representing the Church, are chosen by the Church, priests, representing the Lord, are chosen by Him. The distinction of bishops, priests, and deacons is one of gradation: the former being priests invested with larger powers; the latter being candidates for the priestly office. But that of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers is one of kind—the function fourfold, the office one. And while this fourfold function must be as permanent in the Church as the presence of the Comforter, and has always been more or less perceptible, it cannot be fully developed without the setting apart of individuals by God to each of these four offices.

The question of Apostolic succession, in some respects distinct from that of priesthood or episcopacy, is somewhat misunderstood. Where the Church has none both bearing the name and fulfilling the office of Apostle, Apostolic succession must mean either the presence of men

empowered to fulfil the office without the name, or the unbroken transmission of ministry from Apostles. In either point of view it is a thing highly to be prized in the present defective condition of the Church, as being the best security for a ministry having a divine commission as proper and real as the circumstances allow. That divine commission is indispensable to the efficacy of any ministry; and Apostolic succession is one mode of ascertaining its existence. But it is not the sole proof of divine commission, nor even the best. Present spiritual descent, and not historical succession, is the *sine quâ non*. And if a present divine commission can be otherwise more directly proved, Apostolic succession, in its usual acceptation, gives place. It is admitted by all that bishops do occupy, to a certain extent, the room of Apostles—they are, in point of fact, Apostles' successors; but they are not on that account Apostles. They have no present delegation from Apostles; and their almost unavoidable assumption of Apostolic functions does not give it to them. This is the *non sequitur* in all arguments for the government of the whole Church by bishops. Granting that the unbroken chain of ordination can be proved, it must, in order to be valid, pass through men all empowered to ordain. But power to *minister*, or power to *give mission*, does not imply power to *ordain*. Priests have power to minister, bishops have power to give mission; but Apostles alone, or men personally and presently delegated by them, have power to ordain. Apostolic succession, properly so called, lies in ordination by Apostles continuing in the Church.

Although men may well question whether Episcopal succession be properly Apostolic, and whether Episcopal, even if by a fiction held Apostolic, be the sole form of succession, yet those who have real faith in the Ascension of Christ, and in the gifts which He gave to prepare His Church for His return, cannot doubt that succession of some kind is essentially bound up with priesthood; in other words, that the continuance of the holy ministry throughout the successive generations of the Christian Church is as truly an act of Christ as its gift at the first—else it would cease to be His ministry. Yet on the manner and measure of that succession there may be much diversity of opinion among those who concur in recognizing priesthood. The question, indeed, whether this or that be a true Christian priesthood, does not affect the great doctrine of priesthood itself. But truly, as that is properly an Episcopal Church which has

bishops, that is Apostolic which has Apostles. And in spite of the pretensions of Episcopal ordination to Apostolic succession, the successive appointment of the Christian priesthood must, where it is not performed by living Apostles, arise, in however disguised a way, from beneath; and the greater must thus be blessed by the less, instead of the less by the greater. When we look at the sectarian preacher appointed by election—or the Pope of Rome elected by his inferiors, and ordained by none—at the English bishop or the German pastor ordained by his equal—or the Scottish presbyter ordained by a corporate body—there is no blessing of the Holy Ghost properly descending; none at the present moment seen to flow either from Christ in person, or from any directly and personally entrusted by Him with the ministry of the Holy Ghost to all the Church. Whatever blessing rests on ministry ascends. It is the *effluence* of the remaining life of the body, rather than the *influence* of the life of the Head.

Fifthly: With the doctrine of priesthood the spirit of worship unavoidably decayed. The heavenly mystery of the Real Presence, which faith alone can compass or express, came, in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, to be profanely expounded through the misunderstood technicology of heathen Aristotle, as to substance and accident, in a manner level to the natural man. Hence arose the modern heresy of transubstantiation, which put the finish to the abuses of the Holy Eucharist in the Romish Mass, and converted that unbloody sacrifice of our Saviour's Body and Blood, which should be the centre of all worship, into an object of abhorrence and a test of idolatry. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at, that such evils should have driven the Reformers into an opposite extreme. But it is not a little instructive to see the same attempt to make the spiritual intelligible to the natural, and fix the faith in a frost of logic, repeated among them: by the Lutheran, in the theory of corporeal ubiquity; by the Calvinist, in that of scenic transaction; by the Anglican, in that of faith-created reality; and, in all alike, by the overlooking of that almighty co-operation of the Holy Ghost with the word and act of Christ's minister to effect that spiritual reality which faith contemplates, but does not create; and which, when wrought, abides a mystery still. Men's just horror at the "*opus operantis*" has destroyed their faith in the "*opus operatum*;" and if the Papist has condensed the Eucharist into an idol, the Protestant has too often volatilized it into

a metaphor. Even where Protestants most honour this holy sacrament, and encompass it with worship, it is too little viewed as being itself the crown of all worship—that continual commemorative sacrifice, the communion of which the saints who offer it are admitted to enjoy. They may dedicate themselves to God, as at all times, so when they compass His table, and call that act a sacrifice. In a secondary sense, it is. But they worship God with no memorial on His altar. They feed on that which they have not offered to Him. They do not expect to reap the benefits of Christ's passion from that which God has accepted in sacrifice as its memorial. And while the Romanist seeks edification apart from communion, in the worship of that which should not be worshipped, they seek it in the communion of that with which they do not worship God at all. Thus robbed of its keystone, the fabric of holy worship became more or less ruinous and confused. The word of God, that term of most fluctuating import—meaning now the Incarnate Son, now the canon of Scripture, now the ordinance of preaching—rang in the long-stopped ears of Christendom. Men ran riot in their newly-acquired liberty to search the Bible and proclaim its treasures; they worshipped their weapon; they burnt incense to their drag. Those Scriptures, by which Christ's ministers should judge, were themselves erected, as by Luther when he appealed to them at Worms, so by his followers, into an umpire impersonal, ready, like Roman Catholic tradition, to decide as the quoter pleased. And that word of the Gospel which declared Christ as the foundation virtually took His place. As, among Romanists, the idolatry of the dicta of departed judges afforded a loophole by which to evade the cross of obedience to living ministers of Christ's law—so, among Protestants, the statute-book supplanted both legislator and judge. The Church was based on a word, not on a person. And, instead of learning to offer intelligent in the room of ignorant worship, the mass of German Protestants, although liturgic forms remained, and although possessing the richest hymnology in Europe, soon lost their relish for worship itself. The pulpit, not the altar, has become the focus of the Church; the sermon the reason for the service. Exercises alike excellent, but incongruous, have been molten together. Worship without sermon is barely connived at—nay, has on more than one occasion been denounced as Popery, even when the object of the separation was merely the comfort of the hearers at an inclement season. And that blessed ordinance of preaching,

without the full liberty of which, in its due place and proportion, no Church can retain its first love or go on to perfection, has, from being misplaced and exaggerated, wrought to break down the Church, and eliminate its members. They have little ecclesiastical consciousness. They know little of the *rationale* of worship, or of its distinction from private devotion. For want of teaching as distinct from preaching, they do not make progress in the faith, or make increase as one body; but fruitlessly delight themselves in the mere alphabet of the truth. And even that is rather propounded for their approbation, as a product of the preacher's mind, than addressed to their faith with authority, by one who speaks as the oracles of God. Yet it is not to be denied that the catechetical labours of the clergy, though neutralized by the custom of regarding the Lord's Supper as a thing to be observed once for all, are most unwearied. And, except that the sentimental and individual character of German religion has rendered many of their hymns more suitable for private than public devotion, and alloyed and lengthened them by elements foreign to praise properly so called, no people can boast a collection of psalmody so large, so various, so full of pathos, force, and beauty. Yet nothing can compensate for their omission of the Psalms of David, in which, through inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the afflictions of Christ in the Church, and the motions of the Spirit of joy to "praise God lustily with a good courage" (Psalm xxxiii.), find their fullest expression.

Sixthly: The German holding religion to be opinion, and opinion to be free, naturally reluctates against ecclesiastical discipline. Of it, Calvin beautifully says, "The doctrine of Christ is the soul of the Church. Discipline is the nerves which connect the members; destroy discipline, and you kill the Church. Discipline is the rein that tames the rebellious soul of man—the goad that rouses his lazy will—the paternal rod that kindly chastens the froward." But to the modern German, the idea of being told with authority what to believe and teach, and how to worship—and, still more, of having his spiritual condition investigated or interfered with by man—is most distasteful. Though the first Reformers retained confession as a third sacrament—though the Lutheran liturgy still recognizes it, in both its general and its special forms, yet not as sacramental—and though to this day every one has his "Beichtvater;" yet the whole thing has gone into desuetude, as it could not fail to do where men believe themselves responsible in religion to

God alone, and where other institutions bound up with confession have become a dead letter. Indeed, if there be none to absolve, why confess? One may unburden the heart as well to a friend as to a pastor, if the power of the keys in him be a nullity, or, at best, according to the only idea usually attached to discipline, a mere power to rend away, punish, extrude, and debar. No doubt the Lutherans have the form of public absolution; although, instead of cleansing the conscience for worship, it is used rather to quiet it after sermon. But though its terms be strong, it is generally expounded to mean no loosing of sins by the present authority and act of Christ in the discipline of His house, but a mere solemn and special declaration of that remission of sins which should be preached to every creature under Heaven. As the Jews could not believe that the Son of Man had power to forgive sins, so in Germany few believe that He has committed that power to any. Forgiveness is understood to come rather by an act of faith in the sinner, than by a present exercise of divine mercy through God's minister. Few believe that a man either receives remission of sins and eternal life by discerning, or fatherly judgment, peradventure unto death, by not discerning the Lord's body. And that a man should, in body, soul, or estate, be a whit the worse for excommunication (so solemnly set forth in the following words, "As I extinguish and destroy with my breath this torch's light, so shalt thou be destroyed and blotted out of the Book of Life"), is a thing which none would dream of. Moreover, among those who reduce religion to a mere internal posture of mind, the discipline of fasting—the most scriptural, ancient, universal, and explicit of all Christian practices—has become almost totally obsolete; nay, on principle, condemned as a thing either unmeaning or carnal and proud. And the watchful superintendence of the pastor over his flock by personal or deputed visitation; the exhibition of Christ's brotherly kindness, and knowledge of their state through the deacons of the Church; the daily moral control over each household by its head; the searching and comforting visitation, together with the anointing and healing, of the sick—those offices, in short, which best serve as joints and bands to the body, and by which He comes near to each, whose eyes are as a flame of fire, and His feet as fine brass—are well-nigh unknown. Who in this day will bear to have these things restored? Yet without them how shall the Augean stable be cleansed—how shall the Church rise, from

her worse than heathen pollution and less than Christian respectabilities, to be an abode truly sacred to the Holy One? Abhorrent though the Romish confessional be, in its compulsory use, its inquisitorial extortion, its indiscriminate and polluting disclosures, its venal forgiveness of the unrepentant—yet we cannot forget that the defiling of God's temple is a different thing from profane transgression; and that the mere preaching of the Gospel is not God's adequate means to purge the conscience of the baptized. The practice of confession, voluntarily made to one empowered by Christ to absolve, is eminently calculated to ease the burdened conscience, and to deter from sin itself, by continually reminding us of the sacredness of the Church of God, and *the impossibility of being cleansed from sin by mere oblivion*. There is nothing so hardening as change without contrition, and cessation without cleansing. And the memory of a man occupied with past sin, save in order to be loosed from it, must become defiled. However fruitless the exercise of fasting is as a mechanical act esteemed atoning or meritorious, yet the due observance of it, whether as an act of humiliation for sin, or as an intelligent abstinence on fit occasions from things lawful, to aid us in ceasing from things temporal, is most conducive to our deliverance from that easy religion which serves both God and Mammon. And, however injurious is the interference of the priesthood with domestic concerns, it cannot be denied that a flock in which the shepherd does not know his sheep runs no small risk of perishing. Alas! we need look only at England and Scotland to find neither elders feeding, nor deacons representing and uniting, the flock. In Scotland the people are visited, but not cleansed. In England the clergy have retained their respectable place in society by losing almost all hold on the mass of the people. Where the divine authority of priesthood is forgotten, men may be either teased or neglected by the ministers of religion; but discipline in its reality, in its patience and its power, in its grace and its severity, cannot survive.

Seventhly: In the dereliction of tithe, the Germans have parted with the true acknowledgment that Jesus is the Lord of the earth we inhabit, and the Head of the Church in which we are blessed. They have thus lost the true provision for the ministry, the true countersign of priesthood, and the true means of using things carnal to obtain a heavenly blessing. The usual idea is, that tithe, being a

Jewish institution, has passed away with the Law—that it has been retained or revived in the Christian Church, merely to give the covetousness of the priesthood the colour of divine right, and thus secure their incomes from the grudging of the ungodly—that the tithe of all our increase would be an exorbitant provision—and that, even though it were not, a provision for the clergy can be otherwise more equally and easily obtained. But tithe was paid before there was a Jew. The Jewish tithe was a mere consequence of the Abrahamic—a mere shadow of the Christian. The true payment of tithe could not be till He was raised from the dead, of whom it witnessed that He liveth—the true Melchisedek, to whose type even Levi paid tithes—the true possessor of heaven and earth. The tithe of our increase is the great “*reddendo*” of our tenure. God reserved it in giving man the earth. He is not man’s debtor for it. Man owes it to Him, and therefore to Jesus, whom He has made Lord and Christ. He owes it as the acknowledgment that Jesus is Lord—as the token of gratitude—the pledge of obedience—the condition of blessing—the correlative of descending grace—the expression of dependent meekness. But we cannot ascend into Heaven to pay it. Where shall we find the Lord Jesus but in His Church? To His priests it is not due; but through them it is paid to Him: and as He exercises by them His priesthood, so does He give to them His tithe. The *offerings* of the Church are voluntary, and may be variously applied; but the *tithe* is Christ’s due, and belongs to His priests. They who give to the poor what they should give as tithe show mercy to man by robbing of God. The clergy who exchange it for any other mode of support—be it State salary, or statutory commutation, or stipulated wages, or voluntary bounty—may indeed better their fortunes; but they do in so far disclaim their priesthood, and descend to be pensioners or creditors of men; and when they are paid by the State, they divert national funds from their proper application. The people who withhold it do in so far deny the Lordship and Priesthood of Christ, and in robbing Him rob themselves of blessing. Yet the payment of tithe is a work of faith. Constrained payment, or inquisitorial inquiry, is here wholly out of place. God is the only witness. Although in Sweden the State has still left to the parochial clergy their tithes, and has only taken the revenues of the regulars and religious houses, the man who will best compound his tithe gets the living. Scotland has exchanged the tithe of *every* man’s

increase for a tax on the rental of land. England has lately commuted her tithe for a statutory money payment. The Spanish priests pay one-ninth of the wreck of their tithe to Government. And the German princes have acted consistently in their usurpation over the Church by generally taking tithes to themselves. A clergy who claim civil support cannot refuse civil subjection. A clergy who live otherwise than from the altar in temporal things, are but the counterpart of a people who live otherwise than from the altar in spirituals. And the children of God, now ceasing to submit to the teaching of His Church, are at the same time everywhere beginning to repent of having given Him so much, and daring to ask it back. But there can be no doubt that, if they who live of the altar should feel an obligation to serve God, which clergy otherwise provided for cannot, the people who pay to the altar should feel an obligation equally superior to that of others. If God's care for their support move and bind the one, His condescension in accepting their tithe should equally move and bind the other.

The leading features in the history of the German Church are familiar to all. While the Calvinists have exhibited the greater amount of schism, the Lutherans have fallen most into sloth and heresy. Since the early off-set of the Menonites, the Moravians (a body who profess Episcopal succession, but acknowledge no Episcopal power) carried with them the great majority of those who groaned under the cold philosophy and unblushing error of the Lutheran clergy. The labours and writings of Arndt, Nicolai, and Spener stood like oases in the desert, when the rise of the school of Bengel—a man distinguished alike for orthodoxy, learning, and holiness, and filled with prophetic though sometimes ill-applied light on the Apocalypse—that great key of Christian history and hope—augured the future awakening of the sleeping virgins to the cry of the Bridegroom's coming. The subsequent influence of England in some measure restored Gospel simplicity and awakened proselytizing zeal on the Continent. And the labours of Schleiermacher roused men's attention to new aspects of truth. Those who now continue the contest for faith and godliness with increasing success, are in a great measure exempt from the errors of their respective schools, and gradually attain to a depth and compass of doctrine exceeding the shallow and subjective character of mere Evangelicalism. The tendency of the German theologian, in his

wholesome jealousy of priestcraft, to look askance upon all ecclesiastical government which does not emanate from the State or spring from the flock, and the disposition of those most alive to the working of the Spirit of God to substitute His motions and developments for the call and mission of Christ, whose rule they must subvert by His own gifts, are gradually giving place to more just ecclesiastical views. And now there are few bodies of men who, surrounded if not infected with so many elements of evil, indicate at the same time so much wholesome awakening, such variety of effort, largeness of comprehension, and catholicity of feeling—in short, so many grounds of hope and symptoms of blessing—as the German clergy. It were well if many among us who, from their heights of one-sided, meagre, and morbid orthodoxy, look down with pity upon their Continental brethren, would learn a little from them.

At the Peace of Westphalia, the German States acted wisely in placing the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, and the Reformed or Calvinist Churches on one footing of political countenance and support. The State has neither call nor power to judge in controversies of faith; and though it had, schism does not, like heresy, consist in quitting the Church: it only rends it. The Church, though torn, continues to be the Church; all the shreds of the seamless coat remain. Did the State adopt one, to the rejection of the rest, it would itself assume, or ascribe to its spiritual advisers, Apostolic authority in doctrine and discipline—it would foster schism, recognize among baptized men distinctions that God disallows, and virtually take part against Christ, by taking part against sections of His Church. The Christian State can do no more, and may do no less, than recognize the whole Christian Church. An old sect has no better claims than a new one. In many things the State has been almost constrained grievously to intrude, by enactments, into the sanctuary of God; but where it has done so in regard to any one branch of the Church, it should either repeal them as to that branch, or extend them to all. Any conditions of its being which tie it to one, are, if right on certain occasions, certainly wrong as permanent. To ground the right of the civil ruler on his faith is as wrong as to affix a like condition to the authority of a father, and prevents him from caring for all his subjects alike, in the way of catholicity, not of indifference. The Protestant succession to the Throne of England—which is almost without parallel in Europe, and which coming events may affect—betrays an

infusion of ecclesiastical elements into civil relations, which stands as the counterpart, if not the judgment, of the civil usurpations over the Anglican Church. Since the Reformation, attempts of various kinds have been made by German princes and theologians to arrest the progress of division and restore unity, if not to the whole Church, at least to its Protestant sections. Of this the conference at Sendomir and others are instances. In the beginning of last century, the Greek and the Anglican Churches made mutual overtures, which the alleged defects of the latter on some points arrested. And about the same time, as well as subsequently, the Prussian Government sought to import Episcopacy from England, both as a means of union between the Prussian and Anglican Churches, and also in the hope of giving to the former a greater stability, by which it might better cope with the Papacy. But ecclesiastical institutions cannot be transplanted like trees at the will of man, especially if the new soil be unprepared for them. Although God can hasten His work as He sees good, yet, in so far as regards due preparation rather than number of years, we may say with Frederick Schlegel—

“ . . . Jedes göttlich Neue
Tritt langsam in die Zeil.”

Every new thing wrought of God comes slowly into view ; and Carl Rothe has well compared the condition of a Church which, retaining its own doctrines, borrows its constitution from another, to a metempsychosis, fit for an Oriental tale, but impossible in history. When God gives fresh blessings to any part of His Church, He will give such as are originally and essentially common to the whole, and emanate from one recognized centre. He will not sanction traffic in them ; He will not work blessings through make-believes. The late King of Prussia, on the 31st of October, 1817, the tercentenary of Luther's ninety theses, realized a long-cherished project for uniting Lutherans and Calvinists into one body. He first recommended to both Churches the adoption of one liturgy, as a step to becoming one Church. Afterwards, without any personal inclination to severity, he gave this recommendation a compulsory character, and was led by injudicious, interested, or vindictive advisers to punish with imprisonment, banishment, and fine those who disobeyed his injunction. Few, or none, of the Calvinists did so. But those of the Lutherans who, although idolaters of the great Reformer and stereotypes of his measure of

truth, really appreciated that truth, were not prepared, in false charity or servility, thus, at the command of the civil power, to bid adieu to distinctions which they deemed vital; and, imitating the obstinacy, though not the open rebellion, of the Scottish covenanters, they rejected at once the substance, the source, and the object of the new liturgy. Indeed, based as it was on compromise, and calculated to unite men through indifference, it could only be a congeries of negatives and dubieties, not acceptable to God as a work of positive faith, or to man as a mean toward true unity. Its chief use has been to reprove the Lutherans for being self-contained, and to preserve the idea of union as a possibility in the minds of men. But it cannot succeed, and may be undone. What the divided combine to do must be a sham.

The three great objections to all the theoretical treatises and practical proposals of the Germans in search of unity are these: First, that they seek the union of two or more parts of the Christian Church, to the exclusion of the rest; secondly, that they have sought union, instead of unity; thirdly, that they have sought to arrive at unity through the discussions and efforts of men, and not through the grace of God in the procession and embrace of one Catholic ministry from Christ. As to the first, Rudelbach, in his elaborate work on "Reformation, Lutheranism, and Union," has well stated the distinctions between true and false union. But even he contemplates no more than the union of Protestants, as if the Greek and the Roman Churches were either impregnable fortresses, or utterly destroyed cities. And it surely cannot be a thing pleasing to God, that any two parts of His Church should combine for the purpose of more effectually hating the third as a common enemy. Again, as to the second, it is the greatest mistake to regard religious combination and Christian unity as synonymous. The former may consist with, nay, aggravate, schism. The latter is wholly opposed to it, and cannot embrace one section of the Church, except on principles which recognize the unity of the whole. The agreement of men in one principle is only a greater evil than disagreement, if that principle be untrue. So is their agreement to act in one way worse than conflict or separation, if they do not act on one principle. If union without agreement is vain, so is agreement without unity. Unity in things divine is the action of a common being—of one divine nature in the members of Christ—the fruit of one anointing and of one

ministry given by Him to the whole Church in common. Man can rend the body of Christ, but he cannot bind it. While heresy originates in error, schism more frequently originates in truth. Each has a truth, to which he attaches such exclusive value that he will sacrifice for it the unity of the Church. The extent of his apprehensions being disproportioned to their intensity, he tears himself away to enjoy his own things undisturbed, and denounces as errors truths to which he will not allow their proper place. Thus, the more faithful, the more schismatic he becomes. He can only cease from schism by falling into indifference. He estimates all who approach him by the measure in which they acknowledge his idol truth. One who is identified with no party, and speaks no Shibboleth, is a nondescript, whom he cannot classify—a mystic, whom he does not understand—a neutral, in whom he cannot confide—a Utopian, who will never work. To justify no schismatic section of the Church of Christ he holds synonymous with condemning the whole Church. He that insists on being of the Church Catholic alone, and refuses every human cognomen, is regarded as one not belonging to the Church at all, and worthy to be regarded as a traitor by every Christian denomination. Such a fable has the unity of the Church become; and so is the thing truly wanted by all, not zeal for one's own things, but zeal for the Lord—of which two things the most devoted "churchmen" may possess only the former. Lastly, as regards the third objection, although true zeal for the Lord will excite to seek true unity, it cannot bring it about, save through those commissioned to constitute and maintain that unity. Men cannot first make themselves one again, and then proceed to obtain those ministries by which alone unity can be wrought. That power of blessing which shall bring men back to one, must itself flow from one. Apostles only, who should have always held the Church together, can bind it together again. And no ministry but that fourfold effluence of grace from our glorified Head by apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, can fill the Church with divine knowledge and blessing again. Jesus is the fountain of life—the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The Church has not life in herself. She cannot change the ways of God. Nay,—more: it is a vain attempt to purify the Church except by hope. Without the blessed hope of Christ's glorious appearing—a hope which neither Waldenses, Wickliffites, Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinists, Moravians, Methodists, nor Evan-

gelicals have ever in good earnest held or preached—the Church cannot be prepared for the end of her calling. But can anything seen and temporal, any self-originated impulse or concert of man, any mere sense of duty, any mere dream of romance, rekindle the instant hope of our inheritance? That He alone can do, who is the earnest of our inheritance—who shows us of the Father in the Son—who gives us the powers of the world to come. But how can the Lord come—rather how shall He come—save as a thief in the night; save as in the days of Noah, while this scoff is in the hearts of the godliest, “Where is the promise of His coming, for all things continue as they were”? Although death reigns in the Church until the day when the living shall be changed, the promise held out in Scripture is not that we shall die, but that the Lord shall return; not that the Church shall be eclipsed and unclothed, but that she shall be clothed with His glory. Paul says, “We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.” Who now says that with Paul? Can they believe in the Lord’s return who do not *expect* it; who, as Manning so well says, “silently prescribe a course for the providence of God; who expect to live, and then in due time to die; who say that they at least shall not be quick on earth at Christ’s appearing—that at least now He shall not come; and who neither do nor leave undone anything that they would do or leave undone, though He should never come again”? Can He prepare His way if we do not believe in His return? But the gates of hell (*Hades*) shall not prevail.

Stahl has well expounded the mutual relations of the episcopal, synodal, and collegial elements in the constitution of the German Church; the first being administration by the king and consistory through superintendents; the second, by ecclesiastical synods; the third, by government from the people. Though he does not see how diverse in essence royal and real episcopacy are, yet he shows how impossible it is for national bishops to vindicate the true standing of the Church, and how the synodal constitution, such as that in the Rhine provinces, must conflict with the consistorial, from the false position of both. While the consistories exercise bureaucracy, synods foster popular discussion. The present King of Prussia, in his enlightened desire for the proper independence of the Church, and for the temperate expression of public opinion on all great questions, ecclesiastical as well as civil, has encouraged the meeting of synods. “The wounds,” he says, “which the

Church has given herself, she herself must heal." In diverse parts, small knots of Evangelical clergy came together. These gradually swelled into large assemblies: in some cases, exciting antagonist meetings on the part of the clergy opposed in sentiment to them; but in others, leading to the better result of brotherly conference and combined deliberation. The synod which meets in Berlin has, of course, become the most important. There the working clergy of the land, practically acquainted with the condition and desires of the people, and filled with wise counsels and pregnant thoughts for the future, have done much to break the spell of literary domination and metropolitan coryphæism. The number of faithful men and ministers daily increases; the direction of their piety becomes more wholesome; the Press teams with essays upon the constitution and government of the Church and her relation to the State; and the synodal discussions carried on with heart, forbearance, and frankness are attended by an enlargement of faith and increase of light, which augur most favourably for the future, despite the awakened rivalry of demi-infidel clerical societies, and the prognostications of those narrow pietists who are carried out of their reckoning by a fuller stream of truth. The attention of these synods has been chiefly occupied with the relation of the German to other Churches, especially the Roman Catholic; the true nature of the priestly office; the true limits of ecclesiastical and civil authority; the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, of pastoral and diaconal visitation; the encouragement of worship; the improvement of liturgies; and generally the present hopes and fears of the Church.

On the whole, the transactions of these conferences are eminently subjects for thankfulness, and arguments for hope. Yet, while the Government does not permit them, and they have not as yet proposed to exercise legislative functions, and to reduce to any practical form the valuable thoughts floating among them, the very fact of their inability to do so contains two important lessons: first, that the German clergy, fettered by the State, do not enjoy their due liberty to guide the household of faith; and, secondly, that even if that liberty were vouchsafed them, synods, whether parochial, episcopal, confessional, national, or œcumenical, are not the proper ordinances for either reuniting or governing the Catholic Church. The spiritual demands of the Church in Germany are already such as her

existing institutions cannot adequately meet. But, however the foundations may be cleared and materials gathered, there lack yet the commission and power to build her up in the true fellowship of the Church Catholic. God will rebuild His own house by the proper hands; and all who anticipate Him will only lose their labour. His present work is to kindle intelligent faith and patient desire in the breasts of His people, and especially of the clergy. He will meet their faith and desires, not by their actings, but by His. The command to be free, imposed by the State upon the Church, will never make her so. The recovery of her own proper government must do it. That government is not peculiar to one nation or persuasion, but comprehends the whole. Till it be given, synods of the clergy—if they act wisely and meekly—will indeed express the destitution, the confusion, the remaining faith, and the longings of the Church; but can only separate as they met, and say, “Who will help us?” In being content to do so, they are not unprofitable; for it is when God hears the cry of His people that He will answer it, after having first given them strength to endure, and proved their faith, that it is faith in Him. He will save them from the idolatry both of systems and of leaders. The Apostolic grace will accompany the Apostolic commission, and change dead and changeful doctrines into living and abiding deeds. And, in the language of Manning, a season of stern trial will sift the Church of shallow, petulant, self-loving, boastful men, that the true and loyal hearts may be made manifest, and by one decisive trial, short as it is sharp, win their crown of life.

A very remarkable religious feature of Germany, at the present day, is the extent to which things supernatural have, in some quarters, occupied the attention of men. Northern and Southern Germany are, in divine things, like two opposite poles—the one of rule and order, the other of light and life. For the latter Würtemberg has been long distinguished. Bengel, the father of a numerous prophetic school, and the great reviver of faith in the invisible, was among the first, with Stilling, to recover the forgotten truth of man’s threefold constitution in body, soul, and spirit—the latter, as that part of his being through which he holds communion with God through the Holy Ghost. Although the German mind is peculiarly susceptible of spiritual influences, yet that Rationalism which the creeds and liturgies retained by the Lutheran Church could not check, had so eaten out all practical faith in the personality and presence

of God, that supernatural manifestations, instead of being received as surpassing the limits of man's powers, only induced philosophers to enlarge their definition of the powers of man sufficiently to explain such phenomena. Thus, by not distinguishing between power to act and capacity to be acted upon, instead of cherishing man's capacity to receive the agency of God in a higher way than that of the intellect, they fell into the great error, on the one hand, of treating all supernatural working as a mere development of the powers latent in man, and, on the other, of allowing, without question, the lying wonders of Satan as mere psychological phenomena. If rightly understood, with reference to the Incarnate Son, it is a great truth that all theology is anthropology—in other words, that our knowledge of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is attained through that of the Man Jesus Christ; but, as applied to man independent of Christ, it is untrue. And it is still more untrue that all theology is *only* anthropology. Moreover, while the works of the Spirit are contrary, those of the devil are akin, to those of the flesh. The flesh is his instrument; and one may not be able to say where it ends and he begins. But to say that all this is mere development of human powers, is to consign the world at once into his hands. There are whole schools in Germany—as now also with us—who deny his existence; and not many, even of the devout, who practically believe it. Among those who do, he and his legions are not hated as they ought to be. Men do not dread contact with evil; nor do they adequately feel the importance of distinguishing whether that with which they are occupied be good or evil, divine or Satanic. They do not see that the value of truth lies, not in its being fact—*i.e.*, not in its mere existence, or recognition by the senses of man—but in its proceeding from God. Everything that is, is fact—every fact is fact. But that is all which can be said of it. All fact is not truth—nor shall it be, till God's will shall be done in earth as in Heaven. The dealers in facts deal indiscriminately in truth and falsehood. Yet they conceive themselves secure on their *terra firma* of fact; they commit themselves, in proud blindness of faith, to the guidance of infallible induction; and, forgetting that the works of Satan are matters of fact as well as the holy works of God, they approach, without misgiving, into self-sought relations with things, to say the least, most questionable. Men may justly mourn over the melancholy truth that, in the Christian dispensation—which, from beginning to end, is peculiarly the

supernatural one—God, as the living God, is exchanged for a doctrine, though not for a stock or a stone ; that since the Holy Ghost has been given, and God has found a dwelling-place among men, His presence is more doubted than when the earth was but His footstool ; and that the proof of His presence is less expected than in the world before Christ. The bulk of Christians have, indeed, come almost into the condition of Voltaire, who said that he would believe no miracle for which the Paris police did not vouch. But alas ! not a few of the faithful in Germany, longing to see faith in things supernatural revived, are willing, for this great end, to take the risk of supernatural evil. And they persuade themselves that to believe even in the miracles of Satan is better than to believe in none ; and may be a stepping-stone to believing in the supernatural works of God. Thus they neglect the wise counsel of the Emperor Joseph : “ Pray to God, and don’t gossip about the Devil and his wicked works ; ” and they too well exemplify the words of Goëthe : “ I can infer good spirits from bad.”

“ Denn von den Teufeln kann ich ja
Auf gute Geister schliessen.”

Jacob Boehmen, Jung Stilling, Swedenborg, and Kerner are, although not to be identified, alike signalized by mystical and perilous occupation with things supernatural. Swedenborg, indeed, set at nought all the hallowed safeguards of the truth, and assumed to be not merely what a man well might be, a prophet in the communion and under the discipline of the Christian Church (in which prophecy is the testimony, as apostleship is the rule, of Jesus), but a direct messenger from God, above all ecclesiastical discipline and responsibility, and commissioned to usher in a new dispensation. And he has so sublimated away all doctrinal, historical, nay, material reality, into spiritual glimpses of ethereal relations, as too plainly to betray their evil origin and operation. Although one cannot but marvel at the discretion which runs through the remarks of Stilling regarding the state of the departed, upon the supposition that the things with which he was conversant were lawful, yet one cannot help liking the man much better than his occupation. And granting even that things on which Scripture is comparatively silent were proper subjects for investigation, that investigation ought to be conducted by men having ecclesiastical commission, shielded and supported by the Church, and not by individuals running ahead of all guidance, undervaluing all defence, and thus

treading without compass an unknown territory, where Satan may set what traps he pleases for them. In reading the communications of Kerner from the world of spirits, one cannot but feel, in the things which he relates, an insincerity, unclean familiarity, and mystification—an independence of all Christian order, a passing by the blood of Christ, and a ministering to curiosity and pride—which all the religious phraseology and devout aspirations of the beings really or professedly concerned cannot outweigh. By Stilling's own admission—"He that *seeks* intercourse with the invisible world sins deeply, and will soon repent of it"—there is such a thing as *necromancy*.

Mesmerism seems likely to do in the spiritual region a work similar to that of the Hegelite philosophy in the intellectual. How far homœopathy may be connected with these things, we need not here inquire. Comparing it medically with allopathy, one can only observe how certainly men will both die and recover under the most opposite treatments—by encouragement and discouragement of symptoms—by microscopic fractions and honest multiples—by simplicity and composition. And it is remarkable what an inherent aversion to legitimate agents, and turning to illegitimate oracles, is seen in medicine as in theology. Amulets, of old, were selected from their supposed resemblance to the disease they were meant to prevent or cure—as red stones against fevers, crystal or glass against dropsies; and as there can be no doubt that, in many cases, homœopathy was applied in ordinary practice long before it got a name of its own, so none but the ignorant, extravagant, or interested will give themselves to it alone. The wise practitioner will be homœopath and allopath as the case demands. In itself, the use of the creatures for healing is more than lawful. And, however God may show His power to heal in the gift of healing, or in unction by the elders of the Church, the man who refuses the collateral aid of means is in the same error as he who, in the use of Scripture, refuses tradition and exegetics. But one has an instinctive scruple at the attainment of ends by means professedly natural, yet apparently quite inadequate, lest something else should lurk under them. God has given to different substances different degrees of influence on man; and the operation of a weak influence in a long time, or of a strong one in a short time, is intelligible. But that the weak influence and the short time should combine to produce mighty effects, or that the same substance from the niggard

hand of a homœopath should have a power which it knows not in the bountiful one of an allopath, is a puzzle indeed.* The father of the science plainly hints, though he will not assert, its connection with mesmerism. Many who practise it combine the two. *If there be* in homeopathy anything unclean, one may rest assured that what men call its "prayerful use" will not cleanse it. Prayer is no spell which confounds right and wrong. Every creature of God is sanctified by prayer—for use; but its abuse, if abuse there be, is not. Nor is the plea of science valid. The business of the physician is to heal. Healing is the end, science the means. To the scientific it belongs to make science the end. Let him work on those who will sacrifice their bodies to science; but let it not be advanced at the expense of those who only wish to have it applied. Be all this, however, as it may, of mesmerism itself there can be far less doubt. Its best advocates allow it to be a weapon most dangerous if not wisely handled, and the intelligent Christian can hardly doubt that the weapon itself is wholly unlawful. Britain is the great manufacturing land. It works up the raw material furnished by the rest of the world. Its inhabitants, with all their individual common sense, are proverbial for being gulled wholesale. And while mesmerism has, in Germany—the place of its birth or infancy—been confined for a long period to men of science or to mystics, it has within a year or two acquired among us a vast practical ascendancy. The exhibitions of London practitioners, and the mesmerizing tea-parties of Glasgow weavers—the combination of animal magnetism with the materialism of phrenology and the demi-infidelity of physics—the inveiglements of Christ's ministers into passive, yea, often active, participation—and the hints, more than whispered, that the mighty working of the Spirit of God by handkerchiefs from the body of Paul, aye, by words from the mouth of Jesus, now admits of easy explanation, and of as easy repetition, *without any God at all*—such things may well fill us with alarm. Fancy and fraud may indeed have their share in the matter. With or without bodily disease, some may have susceptibilities and predispositions peculiar in kind or degree. But to persist in complacently shrugging the shoulder at the credulity of men, as if all were a trick, is like fiddling while Rome is burning. And to seek after such

* It is believed that the author's views regarding homœopathy were much modified after his work was published.

exhibitions from curiosity is most dangerous trifling. The tongue of him who makes sport of them will be the snare of his soul ; and he is foolhardy indeed who, even for the sake of truth, does evil that good may come, and takes part unbidden in things which none but one assured by the commission and armed with the panoply of Christ should dare to approach. Man, made in God's image, is distinguished by a will founded on intelligence, and has a proper personality which, embracing his body, shuts it up, and cuts it off from the universe of which it forms a part. A man should not be at the mercy of impulses : he should not move passively in the diagonal of mental or bodily forces ; but, having a will obedient to God and a spirit in communion with Him, he should have dominion over all his members, keeping his whole being in due allegiance, and ready for God's service. The redemption and sanctification of man neither impair his will nor abolish his personality, but bring out his true dignity. Nay, when the Holy Ghost supernaturally uses any member of Christ in the word of prophecy, or any other exercise of scriptural gifts, He does so, not as a resistless power, but as a gracious trust, to be used in obedience to Christ—as it is written, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Ecstasy, though it be divine, is neither an excuse for lawlessness nor a rule for guidance. A Man guides the Church—a Man shall judge the world ; and, if we are to reign with Him, we must, as men, rule ourselves now. That is a false elevation of man which affects his personal acting and responsibility. When our Lord Jesus sat down on the right hand of the Father, Satan, the god of this fallen world, was dethroned from his dominion, in one sense legitimate, over men ; and ought, when he comes to baptized men, to find nothing in them. But he who, through present yielding of spirit or former compromise, tacit or explicit, becomes the mere echo of another's will and counterpart of another's acting, has opened the citadel of manhood, and has sunk to be a mere thoroughfare for every influence, seen or unseen, human or Satanic, which may approach him from any quarter, under the guise of science, philanthropy, amusement, or religion. As regards one benefit proposed by the advocates of mesmerism—namely, its use in religious discipline—it is credibly reported that certain disclosures by a mesmerized priest regarding confessions of conjugal unfaithfulness made to him—disclosures which led to a duel and a death—were what induced the Court of Rome to forbid the use of animal magnetism. And it can be no ordinance

of God that any two men should be to each other as magnet and steel. "This operation of one human being upon another," says Stilling, "would occasion dreadful confusion in the present state of existence. . . The continual increase of knowledge in every department, joined with an increasing falling away from Christ and His holy religion, will continually occasion the present barriers to be burst, and the Holy of Holies to be plundered." As to the threefold medical use of mesmerism, in curing disease, in suspending the sense of pain, and in obtaining indications of right remedies, one can only say that health of body is dearly purchased by defilement of spirit, by establishing a permanent *liaison* with other persons, and by bowing to powers oracular or curative, the abiding influence of which, to-day exercised for apparent good, may to-morrow induce real evil. One can set no limits to the conceivable abominations which may enter into public hospitals and private families through mesmeric coma. And of the magnetic *aura* we may well say as the poet of *aurum*—

" . . . per medios ire satellites . . . amat."

The state of the departed is a subject on which, if the Roman Catholics, and even the Greeks, say too much, Protestants have known too little. The schisms which have rent the communion of the Church militant on earth do not exceed that which has severed the living from the departed. The Church is one in all ages, as well as in all places. Of old, at the Eucharist, celebrated daily or weekly in the constant hope of Christ's return, she read out the names of the departed, as bidding them to their wonted places in her choir, in presence of attendant angels. But now men have almost excommunicated the departed, by regarding them as impassible, superior to the living, not merely in peace and joy, but in dignity also, independent of our prayers, and dissevered from our hope. Although they who have literally "lost their lives" are not perfect while their being is divided and laid low by the curse, and although they must be raised in glory with undivided being, with integrity of nature in body, soul, and spirit, and with identity of person, ere we which are alive shall be changed,—yet Protestants have released themselves from the obligation, recognized by the Church since her beginning, to pray for the rest and peace, and to impetrate the resurrection of the dead. This neglect is no marvel: for to pray for the resurrection of the dead, without any faith that it will be granted to our prayers,

is a hypocrisy which the faithful will not commit: and to pray for it in real hope that we shall obtain what we ask, is too great a draft on our almost expiring faith in God, who quickeneth the dead. Indeed, if the living have so ceased to look for the Son of God from Heaven that they do not expect to be changed, they should as little expect and ask the resurrection of the dead. And the Church of England, in expressly limiting her intercession to that for the Church militant on earth, has only expressed her conviction that the welfare of the saints who sleep and their deliverance from the last enemy are no business of hers, but depend on a power, and await a decree, with which prayer has nothing to do. Of this, however, we may be certain, that as no ecclesiastical revival is Catholic which does not point to the return of the Lord, so no Catholicity is genuine which does not embrace the departed with the living saints. "Warm hearts," says Archdeacon Manning, "cling to the memory of the departed. But it is to their memory, not to their fellowship—to what they were, not to what they are." And again—"No particular branch of the visible Church can be in energetic unity with the fellowship of other Churches, so long as its fellowship with the Church unseen is suspended." Yet whether the doctrines and practices now so prevalent in the South of Germany be right is a different question. Did we forget that man is essentially the same in all circumstances, it would surprise us not a little to find in Germany, unrecognized by the Church, a Protestant purgatory surpassing the Romish—more intellectual indeed, and, though as yet less venal, as irreverently elaborate. It appears that "souls diseased must have their remedy." According to this system, the spirits of the imperfect do, after death, in attenuated schemata of bodies, cleave to the things which were their hindrances on earth; and yet, freed from the veil of corporeal existence, do, in a sensible form, contritely implore the prayers and seek the counsel—yea, hearken in unearthly congregation to the preaching of the living; until, being gradually relieved of their burdens, cleansed and clarified, they become invisible in happier firmamental spheres. One thing is striking about it—that the spirits of great but ungodly men, whose moral sense has lain dormant, are represented as small and undeveloped, and exhibit an appearance very different from one answering to the estimate of the world. This were not the place to weight the amount of truth or error involved in these things. But this is sure,

that no separate spirit has the powers of an entire man; and it is safe to prefer the king's highway to by-paths, and the wholesome symmetry of the Catholic faith to morbid excrescences. There is reason, also, to question whether such phenomena are the spirits of the departed at all, and not mere illusions of Satan. Many primitive fathers of the Church, and even Luther himself, have warned us of such transformations, and bidden us not believe any devil who came professing to be the soul of this or that dead person. The territory is a dark one, and they who have entered it have done so without safeguard, or compass, or Catholic end. Their personal piety and uprightness, of which in most cases there can be no question, cannot preserve them. One cannot help dreading lest those so curiously daring be lost in a mist of error, and follow an *ignis fatuus* for the light of Christ. And the late awful disclosures in Paris and elsewhere concerning the professed success of mesmerism in revealing the condition of the departed, establishing intercourse with them, and even commanding their appearance, tend not a little to confirm such a fear.

In the preceding remarks on the Church in Germany, our attention has been chiefly directed to the Protestant part of it, as that which predominates in spite of the circumstance that in some places the Court, and in others the numerical majority, are Roman Catholics. But it may be well to conclude this chapter by shortly adverting to the position of the Roman Catholic Church in that country. As the sea gains in one part of the world, and loses in another, so the Romish faith, prospering in Great Britain, is on the wane in Germany. Considering the high mental cultivation of the Germans, and their dislike of subjection, obligation, and self-denial in religion, one cannot explain the amount of influence yet retained over them by the Papacy, of which the principles strike to the very core of society, except by seeing that the good of it meets desires in man which national training cannot obliterate, and that its evils comfort the flesh in all its forms. While, on the one hand, the Papal system, in spite of the conflicts which its aggressions have occasioned, stands as a proof that it is possible to embrace the subjects of many temporal governments under one spiritual rule, extrinsic to all; yet, on the other, the civil precautions which formerly in Britain and till lately in Sweden allowed of no Roman Catholic worship, and which now, as in Spain and Austria, so in Germany, attend the

application of the Romish discipline and the levy of Romish revenues in each State, greatly abridge its practical influence. Rome has, in her virtual if not actual recognition of the Westphalian Peace, in her occasional acknowledgment of literary tribunals, in her concessions to the Nestorian Christians, and in many other ways, made compromises at variance with her principles and dictated by no motive so good as that tenderness which accompanies pure zeal for the Lord. But she has at the same time taken care, in Germany, as on all her frontiers, to plant men distinguished for education, wisdom, and moral propriety. There she neither offends the taste nor compels the conscience by things which, although no articles of her faith, she unrelentingly imposes on the simple inhabitants of her interior. Winklemann's graphic sketch of his conversion through her imposing ceremonial, is a testimony at once to her art and to his uninquiring sentimentalism. The day is gone by when she stood as a bulwark against revolution and infidel science. A true Proteus, she has changed her tactics. She now plays her last and desperate game, in wedding superstition to lawlessness. The former champion of divine ordinances is now content to be called "*l'école catholique*," and has descended to outvie the most ephemeral sects in flattering the masses, in boasting of the rich, wise, and influential, in all the parade of platforms and committees, in all the *provoco ad populum* of reports to patronizing subscribers. While men of fixed principles are inefficient for good, through want of adaptation to others, and men of adaptation lack fixity of principle, the Romish Church has managed to combine both, and thus to teach what power a body has for good or evil. But her discipline, like the spider's web, has held the weak and let go the strong. And although the stand which has been lately made for the proper control of the Church over the doctrines promulgated at the Universities is, however unpopular, abstractedly commendable,—yet they who now hear the infidel lectures, and read the seditious addresses of Romish literati, must form strange ideas of either the consistency or the authority of Rome, whose silence (as in the present matter of Ronge) is often as ominous as her voice. But, besides politic relaxations of discipline on the part of the Romish Church towards those without, her own clergy—who, when they have spoken out their thoughts and discontents, have ever, like Febronius, outdone the extreme left of Protestantism—plainly indicate a tendency, whether

justly or not, to reject as unscriptural or intolerable many of her tenets and observances. They chiefly insist on the use of the vernacular tongue; the publicity of the Scriptures; the admission of the people to a share in the appointment of the clergy and the management of the Church; the abolition of celibacy; communion in both kinds; the reform of the confessional; and the abridgment of the Papal authority. While some are actuated by an infidel impatience, others are truly seeking the well-being of the Church. And although Möhler—whose fair pictures of his mother make one wish that they were true, and that he did not know their falseness—quieted matters for a time by his moral influence and apologetic adroitness, yet the principles at work will not long leave such as the above-mentioned objects unattained. While it may be in some cases a matter of principle, at least of policy, for Rome to show, by a well-timed stand, that she has still rights yet unforegone and authority yet in reserve—yet one over-draft on the sufferance of men may, in religion as well as politics, be the signal for total revolt. There are hidden traitors and indignant patriots enough at Rome. And of the Christian hierarchy it may well be said, that if an institution so blessed and holy has been brought into contempt by the impotency of the Greek priesthood, to the Roman belongs the bad pre-eminence of having by their wickedness caused priesthood to stink in the nostrils of men. It is little short of suicide for breakers of Christ's laws to plead His presence with them and His authority.

The present schism of the German Catholics from Rome is a movement of no ecclesiastical promise. Many relics have with impunity preferred more unfounded claims than the coat of Treves; many of their exposers have made as absurd claims as the Bishop to be sufferers for Christ's sake; many protests against such claims, far more forcible than the very common-place production of Ronge, have been made without effect. Many sober-thinking Romanists admit that the time chosen for the exposition of the coat was most unsuitable, and the measures adopted regarding it unwise, nay, unrighteous. And some condemn the worship of the coat as detracting from that of the host. Yet a mere epidemic contempt of relics could never have called forth from the bosom of the Papacy such a phalanx of negation against her most vital principles, or so rent her boasted unity, were there not a chronic contempt of things sacred behind it. Not Ronge's words, but the thoughts which

they set free, have dissipated the prestige of Rome. Although on this occasion infidel scorn and unsatisfied piety have issued from the same prison-house, they could not but take different roads—the one to run riot in the so-called “Aufklärung” of the age, the other to reap disappointment in retiring upon Protestantism, now effete. They might agree to deny, but not to affirm—to pull down, but not to build; and already confusion prevails in their camp. While the Confession of Breslau and Leipzig present the minimum of truth, and betray even in its few short lines the cloven foot of Rationalism as to the vicarious sufferings of Christ and the personality of the Holy Ghost, those of Berlin and Elberfeld do show the pulse of a living faith, and the remains of reverence for the traditions of God. But the Council, if it deserves the name, lately held at Leipzig, as the embryo of a German if not an œcumenical synod, has betrayed by its proceedings the sacrilegiousness of its principles, its destitution of all ecclesiastical consciousness, and its disregard of every divine safeguard. Taking it for granted that men can make a church as well as they can make a club, they have applied for recognition by the State. But the State may well look with suspicion upon bodies of men who can so lightly make crude experiments upon the most sacred mysteries and traditions of the Church; who commit themselves to every wind that blows; whose motto is, “Frei sei der Geist und ohne Zwang der Glaube” (be the spirit free; and the faith unfettered); who are resolved to leave the interpretation of Scripture to the understanding of men penetrated and actuated by the Christian idea—“die von der Christlichen Idee durchdrungen und bewegten Vernunft;” and who hold it to be impossible to impose a rule of faith upon the spirit of man: “unmöglich ein bestimmtes Glaubensmaass für den menschlichen Geist festzusetzen.” And though the sanction of the State were obtained, neither that nor the accession of one thousand instead of a dozen priests would make them a building of God. A plant without a root will not grow. In the men of Berlin one perceives the conviction that discrimination and purification, and not destructive rejection, should be their work. But how to do it they know not. They shrink from being mere congregationalists, and dictating their own faith. They would fain receive it; but from whom? They look to a German council. But a German council is no more Catholic than one confined to Berlin. And though it were, a council summoned by no authority extrinsic or superior to itself

were a perfect anomaly. That would only give to a local evil a universal form, and invest popular domination with the cloak of lawful authority. The council at Jerusalem, composed of apostles, inferior clergy, and laity, was not so formed. Neither was the council which the angel or bishop of each city had around him for help. Neither were the so-called œcumenical councils, which, although world-wide as to representation, yet, in the absence of Apostles, alone entrusted with the whole Church and alone entitled to summon and direct councils, could not be Catholic in constitution; for they were summoned and presided in, not indeed by Apostles, but by the Pope or the Emperor, or both. And neither were national councils, which have always been summoned by the Government or by the Pope. Any such German council would only check individual lawlessness to assert the autonomy of the whole body. In assuming to legislate it must fail; and in its jealousy against legitimate authority, its decisions would express only the illegitimate influence of individuals, or the overbearing mind of one out of many contending parties. The class of Protestants who are casting in their lot with these German Catholics as expressing a further development of Protestantism, and the nature of the encouragement which this schism has received, not from devout anti-Papists only, but from Jew, Greek, infidel, and heretic alike, are such as may well lead a devout Romanist who has joined it to pause and ask himself what he is foregoing and what he expects in taking such a step. He foregoes ecclesiastical unity and independence; catholic government; Christian priesthood; spiritual authority and dependence; divine tradition; confessional safeguards; daily worship; searching discipline; the chastening of the soul through fasting; the cleansing of the conscience through confession and absolution; the anointing of the sick; the supernatural grace of the Holy Spirit to meet the necessities, seal the faith, and sustain the hope of the saints. And what does he receive instead? Power from beneath—commission without authority—mission without grace—concert without unity—compromise without obedience—conflicting private judgments—hearts unsearched—consciences uncleansed—worship profane and disordered—man idolized—baptism degraded to a mere “sign of reception into the Christian covenant,” the Lord’s Supper to “a remembrance of Christ and sign of our fraternity,” and the presence of the living God to an aggregate of opinions—the law of the Spirit of life merged in the law of the land—the

goal of our hope, stipends and churches, and leave to enjoy them. Neither Ronge and Luther, nor Ronge's cause and that of Luther, can be compared for a moment. And if at the Reformation, with all its advantages, so much perilous extravagance issued from such sober beginnings, may we not fear in this godless generation consequences of the worst nature from such religious saturnalia as the present? Czerski, indeed, in announcing his separation from the Pope, says, "I will not become a Lutheran, Calvinist, Mennonite, or Greek Christian. . . . I will be and remain an Apostolic Catholic Christian, an Apostolic Catholic priest." But with what justice, one may easily judge. Unity was that for which Jesus prayed. Visible unity is no mere form; else why cease to symbolize with that which is deemed unclean? It were enough to be separate in heart;—German Catholics, meaning by this not merely Catholics in Germany, but Catholics ecclesiastically subject to German laws are no true Catholics. Catholicity, as it does not stand in multitudes, cannot survive division. Apostolic Christians these schismatics are not. They do not hold the doctrine and discipline of the Apostles; they excogitate for themselves; they reject Apostolic tradition and succession alike; they constitute what they please, and call on Almighty God to adopt that as His. While they call every active man an apostle, apostles truly so called they neither have nor desire. Had they true apostles, to apostles should the Pope resign his usurped yet useful place, and the true Catholic Church polity would legitimately release them from obligation to the spurious. The Roman Catholic would yield to the Catholic Church. Men would not wander like lost sheep, but find the true fold. They would not secede with fleshly jubilation, but be saved with spiritual mourning. A reformation sprung from man, and sacred to the names of men, must be and continue a thing of earth. The Spirit of the Lord is the root, and the exalting of His name the fruit, of genuine revival. As the Papal altars are built over relics, so must the restored Christian altar be identical with the fallen one, and the faith which shall perfect the Church identical with that once delivered to the saints. Tribulation is essential to the exhibition of Christian grace, and the experience of divine comfort. Patience without faith is passiveness; faith without patience is haste. Some would delay the vision through sloth; some would destroy it by zeal. Some would fix the time, and arrogate the power; some would leave both unsought. Suicide and homicide—

suicide in schism, homicide in persecution—are the two sides of unbelief. But alas! how can they who have no peace in believing learn the deep things of God, or be fellow-workers with Him? How shall men of unbelieving hearts share His joy? How shall they who are pledged to a party follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth? How shall they who are brought up without that knowledge of Scripture in which Protestants find both their snare and their safeguard, and who cast off that hierarchy which with all its abuses shielded them from evil, hope to escape, in their defenceless state, the wiles and power of the Devil? To conclude—these Dissidents have published their *faith*. But what of their *hope*? The Romish Church preserves the faith of Christ's return; but she does not hope for it, and cannot dare to desire it, for her efforts are to maintain her place in this world. Yet in separating from her these men have not separated from the world. On the contrary, they claim to take rank with other religious institutions; and abjuring the name, they love the essence, of priestcraft, which is to maintain the trade of religion without preparing the Church for the Lord. But without the hope of Christ's appearing and kingdom, the Church can never become pure as He is pure, and obtain the victory over sin and death. We are called not only to serve God, to wait for His Son from Heaven; not only to wait for Him, but by faith and prayer to hasten His return who shall raise the dead and change the living. In so doing we shall receive from God those ordinances by which our hope shall be maintained, and we prepared. But ordinances created by man contain no earnest of the Spirit, and cannot prepare the way of the Lord.

Nowhere do Papists and Protestants, in spite of occasional heats and broad doctrinal differences, more nearly approximate in spirit than in Germany. In accordance with the general remark, that the nearer men agree the more bitterly they differ, the English Church, which, by its retention of priesthood, stands as the middle term between the two, has assumed the most decidedly hostile attitude to the Papacy. This is evinced by the statutory guards against foreign prelacy, by the third canon of the Church (which, with a suicidal misnomer, calls a Church by law established an Apostolic Church), and by the whole genius of the Anglican symbols, until new light was thrown upon them by the Tractarians, whom the present Pontiff has called Protestants without liberty, Catholics without unity, and Papists without a Pope. The two parties move with us

in orbits wholly diverse. On the other hand, in Germany, being thrown more together, they seem determined to become better friends. In many, of course, this arises from indiscriminating latitudinarianism; but in not a few from a real ability to estimate, and willingness to allow, the good that is in each. They can look on each other without horror. They have a more catholic range of apprehension than characterizes many in the English and Scottish Churches, who seldom deign to look at others, save to draw comparisons flattering to themselves. Instead of always contemplating their differences, or expecting to effect union through one party swallowing up the other, they begin rather to inquire wherein they agree—which is certainly the right preparation, yet not the substitute, for true union. There are many Romish clergy whose preaching of justification by faith is clearer, and their reverence for Holy Scripture greater, than that of their Protestant rivals. And many Protestant clergy in Germany, although without courage or permission to act out their thoughts, have an increasing recognition of what is truly valuable in the Papacy. Indeed, if the eyes and hearts of Western Christians were at the same time more turned to the Greek Church, which embraces a third part of Christendom and retains, untainted by the recent errors of Rome, a great body of primitive doctrine and discipline unknown to Protestants, much would be done towards that unity which has been so long unknown as to be deemed an impossible, if not unscriptural, dream. Still, mere unity without hope would leave the Church where she is. She must in holiness seek her future place, not establish her present in sin—else she will but pervert the help of God. On the one hand, whatever tends to secure and decorate the Church in the earth, instead of teaching her to wait for the Son of God from Heaven, will be her greatest curse; and on the other, the hope of the Lord's return cherished by those who despise rule, rend the body, quench the Spirit, or resist holiness, is an utter delusion. Perfect holiness is the counterpart of eternal life. Both we have in our living Head, but both must be seen in us. The promise that the gates of hell (*i.e.*, Hades) shall not prevail against the Church, is no promise of infallibility (though she ought to be infallible), but a promise that death shall be swallowed up in victory. When sin is destroyed its wages shall cease. They that sleep shall wake at the voice of the Son of God; they that are alive shall be changed, and behold Him in whose likeness they are.

CONCLUSION.

“Es muss sich wieder eine sichtbare Kirche, ohne Rücksicht auf Landes-gränzen, bilden, die alle nach dem Ueberirdischen dürstigen Seelen in ihrem Schoosse aufnimmt.”—NOVALIS.

As the Church is the mainspring of society, the destinies of the latter are bound up with the condition of the former. God tells us, by Malachi, that He will turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the children to their fathers, lest He come and smite the earth with a curse; and there never was a time when all classes seemed more apprehensive of evil, and busied to avert it, than the present. All are dissatisfied with the existing state of things; they cannot repose in it; and pressed to exchange it for another which shall present a firm footing, they are at a loss whether to advance or to retreat. Some, indeed, would combine the past and the future, according to the words of A. W. Schlegel:

“Das ächte Neue kömmt nur aus dem Alten:
Vergangenheit muss unsere Zukunft gründen.
Mich soll das dumpfe Gegenwart nicht halten.”

But the great majority are resolved into two classes—those who retreat upon things past, and those who rush on to things future. Of these, the former class has hitherto been rarer than the latter, because it is properly the child of fear. But now that things present minister to the fears of the godly, it becomes daily more numerous; and, although first found among the cautious actors of England, will soon swell its numbers among the more fearless speculators of Germany.

This retreat upon antiquity is seen alike in every sphere of life—ecclesiastical and civil, public and private, literary and operative. Men seek to re-invest themselves in the world. Every one who can, hunts up his pedigree. Mediæval tournaments revive. Obsolete institutions and rusty orders, ancient architecture, ornament, and furniture, are restored. The antique in the fine arts is the rage. Gothic churches, those “petrifications of our religion,” are

humbly mimicked. Old books are reprinted; standard works are dressed up in a thousand forms; a thousand changes are rung upon one subject; martyrs obtain monuments, heroes and statesmen statues, in an age incapable of such an offspring. All is daguerreotyped and soulless. Men live, not to act, but commemorate. They converse with non-existent things. In that puny haste which has neither strength nor time for solid acquirement, they would pack all knowledge into a nutshell for the self-taught dabbler, much like a portable soup. As with the body, so with the mind; they live on ether and ragouts, instead of roast beef and stout; they have no honest dead-weight of flesh and bones. Religious antiquaries draw out from oblivion treasures, liturgical, symbolical, doctrinal, and ministerial, which in their proper place are most valuable guides, but on which—partly from misdirected and curious zeal, partly from cowardly avoidance or despairing relinquishment of the post where the battle truly rages—such men lavish those affections and efforts which the living stones of the Church and the family of man should engross. The timid, retreating as in the days of Noah before the rising waters, retire from post to post, from the field of Dissent to the outpost of Presbytery, from that to the walled city of Episcopacy, and thence to the fancied citadel of Papacy, in the hope to hold out there. They seek “fuller grace and higher privileges,” not in following on to know the Lord, whose goodness is prepared as the morning—not in laying hold on eternal life, as the promise set before us—not in hearing what the Spirit saith, alike nigh to them as to their fathers; but in going back as far as they can into things hallowed by distance. They worship the deeds of faith instead of doing them; they boast of the noble works which God did in their fathers’ days, and in the old time before them, not in the hope of witnessing the like, but as a substitute for seeing them. And while many would spend their whole energies and life in defending or advancing the Church, which without the Lord is a mere “nehushtan,” there are few who will do the like to hasten the coming and kingdom of Christ. In one word, the business of such men is not to live, but to mimic life—to galvanize the dead. As the Israelites embalmed Joseph, so has the truth been embalmed. And they who should be mourning its death are boasting of its dead remains, and seeking blessing from the hand of the dead, as the Greek Church at Kieff from the laying on of the hand of St. Clement of Rome. Whence is this? The age is effete;

it has lost all elastic vigour and creative power; and, unable to grasp the future, it worships the past. "There is within us," says Manning, "that which is ever slackening its intention, ever rekindling its old imaginations, ever feeling around for its old supports, ever looking back on its former self." These things betray men's convictions that the world is soon to pass away, and their covetous desire to die with all it has around them. They betray a conviction that a great day of mustering is at hand, and the desire in man to bring up in that day the best he can show. Above all, they betray the fear which impending darkness generates; and the desire of man to retrace the steps which have brought him into deep waters, to return into his mother's womb, that he may find regeneration thence; and, by transplanting himself many centuries back, to put them between him and danger. The fact is, that the promise of Christ—"Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world"—which is the constant strength of the spiritual man, is that from which the fleshly man continually shrinks. Anything but ministration from a present God. To boast of God's presence with our fathers—to admire the way in which He led them—to call ourselves Abraham's children—to display our spiritual ancestry and privileges—nay, to follow the footsteps of those who have followed God,—all this consists with religious modesty and worldly respectability. It demands no faith in the invisible—it infers no cross. But to follow God does. Those can delight to dwell where God has been who could not bear to dwell where He is; those can hear God's truth who could not bear to hear God, and who are puffed up for the Church, as "our excellent Church," against the Lord and all whom the Lord may send to reprove or restore her. Among those who justly maintain the value of that measure and manner of divine commission which lies in Apostolic succession, many would reject the full measure and direct form of the same, were God to restore in the Church Apostles themselves, whose successors bishops are, but not their delegates, and whose place they inadequately fill, by force of circumstances, but not by right.

The exaggerated importance attached to symbolism and antiquity originates in forgetfulness of two things—that the Christian Church is the substance of all shadows, and that the Christian dispensation is in the state of progress to an end. We are the heavenly reality. We cannot be both type and fulfilment—shadow and substance—at once. The

acts of the Church are significant; but they are not the less real. They are never mere scenic transactions. Everything was created to speak of God, and should speak of Him in His house. It is right to honour God now with all we can command. But the nature of that which we can command is accidental, and not essential. The symbols of the Jewish Tabernacle were unalterably appointed and essentially required by God. But in the Christian Church, which is itself the divine antitype of divine types, we do not re-enact a typical work, or exhibit pictures of what we are; and in it the will of man cannot give value to symbols arbitrarily selected by himself, however appropriate they may be. In the kingdom to come, all nature, purified by fire and apt for its proper use, shall lie ready to the hand of the Church, then inheriting it and instructed to use it. Till then nature is but partly apt, and we are but partly instructed. We have but the earnest. And although the Church is the place where that earnest should be seen, yet glory is the exception, sacred simplicity and pure moderation the rule of her present action. She should be sustained under the cross by the foretaste of deliverance; but she should not substitute the glory for the cross; and if she may not do it in deed, it cannot be fitting to do so in symbol. Yet the body of man is a part of the being who worships; and everything made can be sanctified to God. Forms, whether in liturgy, bodily action, clothing, furniture, or architecture, are not mere helps, but proper constituents of devotion; and so far from being hindrances to true spirituality, they not only demand a constant and watchful exercise of faith for their due observance, but nourish true faith, detect its counterfeits, and mortify the bustling vanity of man. Moreover, many of the most cardinal doctrines and practices of the Church are, as Bishop Beveridge observes, indebted for their sanction to tradition alone. Yet nothing can be more untenable than the position of those who defend every observance and tradition of the Church as deserving of instant acceptance. Tradition is contradictory—the tribunal is uncertain—the proofs are unattainable. And were all these objections removed, this insuperable one remains—that the tradition which we have must necessarily be defective, because it is that of the Church while destitute for eighteen centuries of the Apostolic office, to which especially it belongs to receive, conserve, and declare the traditions of God. Infallible guidance is the proper guidance of Christ. In so far as it is not infallible,

it is not His. He has instituted the means by which His infallible guidance may abide with His Church till His return—viz., the ordinance of Apostles, aided by all those helps which the Church can afford them, in the way of ministry and counsel. Were such means completely present and faithfully observed, she would be infallibly guided now. We are no more called to imperfect guidance than we are to imperfect holiness. We are called to perfection in both even now. But as the desertion of our baptismal standing infers every degree of unholiness, so does the mutilation of our Apostolic constitution infer all degrees of error. Therefore it is that the traditions of the Church, which should be infallible, are full of error, and demand revision, not by self-sufficient religionists, not by a few bishops or by all, but by Apostles. Yet God has not forsaken His Church, though she has forsaken His ways. As, in the absence of Apostles, He has still preserved a measure of Apostolic authority and grace, so has He in their absence preserved a measure of faithful tradition, suited to the circumstances of the Church. Hence, instead of presuming, in our individual pride, that everything is wrong till it is proved to be right, we should presume that the Church has been led aright, and very slowly and guardedly believe the reverse, remembering the words of Bishop Hall: "Heavily neither soul nor church can err that walk heedfully in the steps of the universal and ancient Church;" and not less those of Wordsworth:

"Gather wheresoe'er ye safely may
That help which slacking piety requires,
Nor deem that he perforce must go astray
Who treads upon the footmarks of his sires."

The history of the Church may present repeated fulfilments, each fuller than its predecessor, as her labour-throes recur with increasing strength; but the great consecutive acts of God, in the Church and in the world, happen only once. The natural man (whatever the Christian apostasy may do) shall never again attain that perfection in painting, sculpture, oratory, philosophy, and heroism which immediately preceded the appearance of the Son of God in flesh, to blow upon its glory and beauty. There is no flood, but one; no call of a patriarch, no election of a nation, no dispensation of the law, no incarnation of the Son, no descent of the Holy Ghost, no Christian Church, no dispensation of grace, but one. There is but one Creed, one Canon, one Greek and Roman schism, one Protestant separation,

one Infidel apostasy, one Antichrist. As there is a classical era in all things—an era which stamps the philosophy, the taste, the science, of both past and future—so there is a normal era in the history of divine truth and rites, which does not owe its being to the mere personal character of men, and which has both summed up the past and given law to the future. Though the end of the Gentile dispensation and its beginning form parts of a unity, the former should be no more a repetition of the latter than the harvest of seed-time. The same instrumentality should work. The Fathers of the Church—Apostles—the legitimate successors of the first—should be seen co-existent with, not supplanted by, bishops, their sons. But the former works can be no more recalled than the former times. We can uncreate nothing. To square all things in England once more by Magna Charta would be not conservation, but revolution. The power which brought us out of our mother's womb will not replace us there, or bring us forth again if we return to it. The mighty power which raised Jesus from the dead is present with us now. And the matter in hand now is, not the mere restoration of mutilated ordinances to efficiency, but the rescue of those ordinances from their mutilated state, and the putting forth of the power of God to usward who believe—not the setting up of calves to worship, but the waiting for the fiery law of God's right hand—not the interposition of a glorious machinery and a long vista of events between us and the blessed return of the Lord, but our preparation in holiness for His coming as a thief in the night.

On the other hand, those who seek safety in advance instead of retreat, aim at a development of Christianity suited to the times. As there are both a true and a false adherence to the past, so are there both a true and a false development. A false development is at present more popular, and must be more dangerous, than retreat. And, therefore, if those who seek a true development would avoid being either seduced after the false or mistaken for its advocates, it is most important for them to discriminate between the two. In the first place, the Church, having begun in the Spirit, cannot be perfected in the flesh. The Holy Ghost must be the agent—as much in a late as in an early age—in a civilized as in a rude one—in the midst of Christendom as among the heathen. Secondly, the instrumentality must continue the same—it must be the operation of *persons*. Whatever adventitious aids may be employed, faithful witnesses must do the work, for Christ is a man.

Thirdly, the form of that instrumentality—the functions exercised by these faithful men—must continue the same. The ecclesiastical ordinances, originally given from Heaven to the Church, cannot be mutilated, confounded, or supplanted; for Christ, from whom the blessing comes, conveys it in the way of God, and not in the arbitrary ways of men. Lastly, the rule of action must remain the same. The Holy Scriptures must be interpreted and applied, with the help of the whole Church, by men commissioned of Christ to embrace and guide the whole, by men empowered of Him to apply to existing circumstances His unchangeable doctrine, with due consideration of the wants, the weaknesses, the diverse situations and capacities of the faithful, with due reverence for all that past generations have believed and practised, and yet with wisdom to discriminate, and holy courage to separate, between the precious and the vile—so that gold, silver, and precious stones alone may be builded on the true foundation. Such are the conditions and the germ of true development. But the attempt to perfect the Church by learning, talent, wealth, patronage, or popular favour, instead of the gifts of the Holy Ghost—by books and societies, instead of men—by ecclesiastical functionaries of various kinds and orders, instead of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers; the substitution of novelties for the common faith, of other canons for the inspired Scriptures—nay, of other Christs for the Christ of God; in fine, the attempt to give this world the religion it desires,—is not true development, but false. If every science, nay, every handicraft, has its traditions, which none violates without loss, how much more the mystery of the faith! While each fresh system of philosophy has destroyed its predecessor, all phases of Christianity have a common ground. What subverts the former truth is no development of truth. But if the living traditions of God did not close when the Apostles died, how much less did they do so at the expiry of any one century—the extinction of any one School—the death of any one Father of the Church! As long as our conflict lasts and our circumstances vary—as long as the Spirit of Christ is with us—so long flows the stream of divine tradition. As the Anglican Church now counts it all but sacrilege to question the perfection of Reformation wisdom which, three centuries ago, was itself a novelty,—so many who count it treason to offend against the Fathers despise the tradition of the last three centuries.

All Christendom feels that the truth, in its accustomed forms, has lost its hold upon the children, and its power against the enemies, of God; that the efforts of present theology only aggravate what they are intended to cure; that truth without power pleads its pedigree in vain; that unity, at the time when all men seek it most, most baffles their pursuit; and that the condition of the world imperatively demands some living and catholic principle of reform. These facts are ascribed, by various parties, to various causes. The enlightened Christian and Churchman ascribes them truly to the unfaithfulness of Christians in the use of the precious gifts committed to them; to their unequal ways, which have perverted the equal ways of God; to their unbelief, which has emptied every divine institution of its blessing, and so caused God to seem unfaithful; and to their persistence in evil, whereby they defeat the answer to their own sincerest prayers. But the infidel hails a fresh proof that Christianity is a mere *mythus* or pious fraud, which has had its day, like those of Egypt, Judea, India, Greece, and Rome. Totally blind to the truth so well expressed by a living divine, that the Church is not a piece of mechanism moulded by the human will, or put together for the uses or expedients of men or nations, but a mystery partaking of a sacramental character, framed and ordered by God Himself, he accordingly sets himself to inquire, what new religious invention the governments of this world can call in to their aid, in order to fortify themselves by the superstition of their subjects. The Rationalist, while professedly acknowledging Christianity as the knowledge and service of the true God, really changes its essence in seeking to remodel it. The Scripture saith: "If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye shall also continue in the Son and in the Father." But, with one doctrine for the Alpha, he would have another for the Omega of the faith.

"Diruit, edificat, mutat quadrata rotundis."

He would substitute for the operation of the Holy Ghost the wit, the learning, the power, the wealth, of man; and for the ordinances of Christ, the confederacies or institutions of man. He would draw from other sources than Holy Writ, or use it as a mongrel document, in which, as the container of God's word, but not the very word of God, he may discriminate and choose for himself. And destitute of faith in the guidance of the Holy Ghost, he would cast off the whole

tradition and authority of the Church—not, as the pietist, for morbid conscience' sake, but for the purpose of starting unfettered and unprejudiced with fresh systems and practical measures agreeable, at least tolerable, to the spirit of the age. Indeed, he scruples not to say, that “La loi sorti de la Revolution Franaise a  t  assez large pour faire vivre d’une meme vie ceux que les parties religieux tenaient separ s”—to apply to the healing power of science the maxim, “Cest l’homme qui divise ; cest Dieu qui reunit”—and to assert that religious life appears not only in men of positive faith, but also in the votaries of philosophy. But it is a true and weighty saying—“Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines.” And no less so is the following: “Die in ihren wesentlichen Bestimmungen unwahre Form, den wahren Inhalt nicht in sich schliessen kann:” “the form untrue in its essentials cannot contain the truth.” It is, moreover, well worthy of remark, that Roman Catholic policy here walks hand in hand with Protestant licence. The Romanist no doubt maintains, as before, the authority of tradition ; but he does so, not for the purpose of preserving all unchanged, but in order to justify whatever change seems politic. The former advocate of infallible continuance is now the advocate of as infallible change. He professes to carry out the development which the Holy Ghost, ever present, dictates in the Church. Yet his principle is truly the same which he supposes to have actuated the Reformers. If it be once admitted that departure from existing principles may be a development of truth, who shall decide whether the true development is to be found in the Diet of Augsburg, or in the Council of Trent ? And were the Romish Church to succeed by such a *ruse* in catching stray Protestants, the fear expressed by Quinet is not ungrounded, that she would be more troubled by her converts than by her foes. But even among those in Germany who would not intentionally trifle with the truth, there are too many actuated by the false theological principle, that the things which are can be gradually converted into the things which are to come without being all made new, and that God will perfect His Church by adopting the means which man has devised. They expect the Holy Ghost to restore the full grace of God to the mutilated, confounded, transmuted ordinances which exist, instead of restoring those ordinances themselves to what they once were, and yet should be. And as the Church of England expects the full blessing through bishops without apostles ;

the Church of Scotland, through presbyters without bishops; the Romanist, through usurped apostolate; the Greek, through independent patriarchs; the worldling, through Acts of Parliament; and the sectary, through personal separation from the unclean,—so do these expect that professors, and philosophers, and the books of dogmatic theologians shall be used of the Holy Ghost, as substitutes for the ordinances of Christ, not merely to awaken, but also to rebuild the Church. Indeed, not a few go far to merge divine wisdom in human, and to regard the blessed Spirit of Christ as only the most efficient tool of philosophy. “Das Wissen, von Gott,” they say, “und seiner Welt ist eben auch die Vollendung des weltlichen Wissens:” “the knowledge of God and His world is also the completion of worldly knowledge.” And as the knowledge of God will ultimately disclose to us the nature and relations of all things, so the true way to commend the truth to this generation is to show how it can advance the cause of science; how it can descend from being the great end of man, to be the best form of natural wisdom; in short, to show how the Holy Spirit is the best literary teacher. Thus they solve the great problem of our time, the reconciliation of the doctrine of the Church with science and reason. In all this they forget that the creature lies under the curse, and can at present be known only in a manner conformable to the same. Although the saints shall yet know the truth of all things, that shall not be until all be delivered from their present corruption, disorder, and darkness, in that kingdom which the reign of Solomon foreshadowed. The Spirit of Christ—the earnest of that kingdom—who blows upon all flesh, will not build up this natural and present world, or enable us to outstrip all other students by getting at worldly wisdom in some new and better way. Creation must be regenerate in order to be rightly known; as we must now be, in order rightly to know it. We see not yet all things put under Christ. Our knowledge is that of a mystery. Natural religion may be a step to revealed; but revealed religion is not the mere perfecting of natural, for it respects that which transcends all things natural. If the Roman Catholic religion has anticipated the kingdom of God, the Christian philosophy of Germany, in its well-meant but vain attempts to amalgamate irreconcilables, has no less done so.

However, the worst of all spurious developments is that which, under various forms, assumes to be a new dispensation of the Spirit—an addition to the imperfect dispensation

of Christ. It is the more dangerous because of its spiritual character, and its apparent resemblance to the scriptural revival of the Church. The idea of three successive dispensations corresponding to the persons of the adorable Trinity has often reappeared in the Church. And Lessing decidedly adopts it, when he says that he thirsts for a new gospel—for the time when man shall do good merely because it is good—when the third age of the world shall be ushered in—when the new covenant shall be made old, as the old was by it—and the dispensation of the Spirit shall succeed the dispensation of Christ. Such an idea, however, rests on one of two heresies—either that which reduces the Persons in the adorable Godhead to modes of action, or that which supplants the second by the third. While the true Paraclete takes of the things of Christ, the false Paracletes show their own things as fresh from God. They may witness against Antichrist, talk of the Catholic Church, excite many hopes and alarms, inculcate many duties, torment or flatter men in a thousand ways, and boast of many powers and blessings; but they cannot confess Jesus Christ come in flesh; and every Spirit that does not confess Him, though it profess not to deny Him, is not of God. In the Church of God the man is the master of the spirit; but in their delusions the spirit usurps upon the man. It is, therefore, most important to beware of the elevating spiritual gifts, which should be for the comfort and use, into the absolute guidance, of the faithful. Their proper place is subordinate and subject to Apostolic rule and doctrine. In such a place Wessel, the precursor of Luther, was ready to acknowledge them, “provided they were not made the keystone and anchor of faith.” Such delusions, however, as that of Mahomet, that of Joachim, that of Swedenborg, and others now rife in Switzerland, bespeak the desire of man to have a ministry which shall lead him on into spiritual experiences and conflicts, and into the hope of Christian perfection and divine consummation. This desire the ministries of the Church should have satisfied; and by failing to do so, they have driven men in despair into the arms of delusion. It is a perilous thing for a leader to tarry behind. Many a time, as John preceded Christ, have faithful men been raised up to break ground for a thorough reformation. But instead of waiting for that, the Church has mistaken the awakening voice for the blessing itself. The former has been worshipped, and the latter lost. Who can tell what God would have pro-

ceeded to do had Luther's mission been understood? Who can tell what stifled glory may have lain in the beginnings of the Anabaptist delusions? How many fruits, nipped in the bud here, shall be matured—how many talents, wasted here, be developed in the kingdom to come!

"Fear, and the pit, and the snare, are upon the inhabitants of the earth." Alarmed at the defencelessness and perplexity into which the neglect of God's ways has brought us, men would fain retreat upon the institutions of the past, hoping to find in them the same shelter and blessing which their fathers found. But the hope is a vain one. The Spirit of Christ uses not past things, but present. Hence the danger is, that, having sought God in vain where He is not to be found—having found no water in the pit—men will conclude it vain to seek God at all, and, according to the simile of the prophet, will come up out of the pit to be taken in the snare, and seek from Antichrist the blessing for which they no longer hope from Christ. Different parts of Christendom may exhibit different stages of this process; nay, in some all its stages may appear at once. In England, the second is the most obvious at present; in Germany, we see especially the first and the last; but there are also symptoms of the second. And the Germans will sooner or later find that in it their true salvation does not lie. An increase of reverence for the things hitherto done and believed in the Church is very needful and right; but health and cure are to be sought from a living God. "They that wait on Him shall increase their strength; they shall mount with wings as eagles." "Ein Vogel schwingt sich auf wo Eiche fallen:" "the bird soars when oaks fall." But, in order to obtain this health and cure, men must feel their necessity. The dreams of those who are at ease will not serve. Men charge the fruitlessness of prayer upon God. But alas! well may the poet ask—

"Hast du denn auf deinen Reisen nichts als Heuchler Volk erblickt,
Keinen welcher gegen Himmel wirkliche Gebete schickt?"—

Hast thou in thy wanderings seen none but hypocrites,
None who send up real prayers to Heaven?

There must be a cry out of the deep mire, wherein there is no standing. Distress will create an intelligent desire; an intelligent desire will create the prayer of faith; and the prayer of faith must prevail. Man cannot create the blessing; but the God of mercy and truth, with whom it is, will

assuredly grant it unto those who can sincerely say to Him—

“ Wir harren schon so lange,
Und Du erscheinst noch nicht,
Im harren wird uns bange;
Wir sehnen uns nach Licht: ”

He will save, when to man it seems impossible.

Bishop Beveridge has well said that no ecclesiastical constitution can be called right but that which squares with the Apostolic as a model. The Church is so enthralled by the “ eiserne Umarmung ”—the iron embrace—of the powers of this world, that nothing but the hand of the Lord can loose the bands of her neck. Were the Pope, the only symbol of her independence, to fall, the words of Frederick the Great would be realized—“ Die grosse Mächte werden keinen Statthalter Christi mehr anerkennen. Jede wird einen eigenen Patriarchen in ihrem Lande ernennen: ” “ The European Powers will acknowledge no longer any Vicar of Christ. Each will nominate a patriarch of its own for its own dominions. ” The Church is too thoroughly rent in pieces for any will of her parts to bind them together again. And the desultory efforts of pietists who would turn the world into a cloister and the Church into a conventicle, and who, with all their good intentions and personal worth, well merit the appellation of “ namenlose Wilden, ” given them by an ante-Reformation reformer must wholly miss the mark. No provisions emanating from the State—no assembled synods—no clever proposals—no learned reasonings—no making of many books—no concert of many men—no armistice with evil—no cosmopolite indifference—no sentimental charity—no miserable ultra-Protestant Swiss coinage of a creed—no Gustav Adolph societies—no combinations of Protestants against the Papacy to make all men Protestants—no craft of the Papacy to bring all men back to her bosom—no ukazes of the Czar imposing the Slavonic faith—no efforts of Greek patriarchs to make all men orthodox—no cobbling of a net which cannot hold the fish—no calling up of the ghosts of things to guide living men—no wisdom or power, no idolatry of men—can possibly do the work. Nothing but that precious oil which flows from the Head—nothing but a mission from Him adopting and embracing the whole Church—nothing but the substitution of a legitimate for an illegitimate ecclesiastical centre, of a catholic for an uncatholic ministry—nothing save a church polity, neither usurped by man, nor imposed

by the State, nor voted by a majority, nor bolstered up by flesh, but given of the Lord—Apostolic in origin, character, and power—embracing the fulness of the Spirit—evolving the ministries of Christ, no longer curtailed and confounded by the bungling improvements of man—accordant with the common faith—adapted to man in wisdom and mercy, but unalterable in essence—spiritual, impartial, and holy—will do it. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers must again comfort, reprove, correct, and instruct;—the raising of the dead, the casting out of devils, the cleansing of lepers, the healing of the sick, the voice of the Comforter in tongues and prophecy, the manifest judgments of the Holy One, as a consuming fire in which no dross can live, must bring men out of dreams into realities again, and lift the Church out of the *taxis* of this world, if ever she is to become truly the salt of the earth. She must be sent from Christ as He from the Father, in order to bless the world. And the instant hope of His appearing and kingdom is alone able to purify and uphold her. Then, be the faithful remnant as small as it may, shall a catholic work be done, and a witness such as God will acknowledge be given, by faithful men and by the Holy Ghost, to His present grace and coming judgment. Not by power and might, but by babes and sucklings, will God still the enemy—not by those who reproach, and subvert, and break loose, but by those who encourage, sustain, and abide—not by those who confederate to build Babels of their own, but by those who look for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God—not by those who fold their hands, but by those who do their duty.

Thus only can the Church be effectually preserved from undue interference with the affairs of men. She knows that she is born to rule; and if she limits her hopes to this world, she will ever strive to do so now, whether by Papal priestcraft or by sectarian flatteries. But if she truly waits to sit with Christ on His throne, her ambition, rightly directed, is harmless—yea, unspeakably helpful to the powers that be, and to the fulfilment of every social duty.

Every nation has a sphere peculiar to itself, together with its share of a work common to all; and the proper part of each is to contribute its utmost towards the preparation of Christendom and the world for the appearing and kingdom of Christ. As none shall stand in the judgment but they who are crucified to the world, so we cannot be crucified to the world if it is not crucified to us. While

Germany holds out so many elements of hope, the unclean commerce of the German mind with everything that may be known may well excite alarm as to the part which Germany may act in hatching the cockatrice egg of evil. Nothing can touch the seat of defilement—nothing can cleanse the spirit of man—but the Spirit of God. He works by the personal offices of the Church; and in their restored order and efficiency lies the hope of Germany. It matters little what share she may take in the strifes of the potsherds of the earth—how formidably her children may bristle as a nation of soldiers—what part she may act in a European Pentarchy—how long she may sing, in defiance of France,

“ Sie sollen ihn nicht haben,
Den freien deutschen Rhein ”—

or how long the memory of Hermann may live in the linked escutcheons of her diet—

“ Ein Mann, ein Bund, ein freies deutsches Volk ! ”

It matters little how she may stand the sappings of Russian intrigue, and scatter the clouds of the North—or how independent her “ Zollverband ” may make her of England’s “ *porrecta majestas ad ortum Solis ab Hesperio cubili.* ” It matters little how long she may lead in literature—how nearly she may rival in agriculture and arts—how great a thoroughfare of trade she may become—or with what railroad speed she may go ahead in that reckless career in which

“ audax omnia perpeti,
Gens humana ruit per vetitum nefas.”

But it does matter very much, at this turning-point of her destiny, whether in her the evil shall choke the good, or the good surmount the evil—whether her children shall belong to the wise virgins or the foolish—whether she shall furnish sons of God or sons of Belial—whether Christ or Antichrist shall be her God. The war in heaven now rages between the spirits which confess and those which do not confess Jesus Christ come in flesh—between men holpen of Satan to perfect and deify the creature, and those holpen of the Holy Ghost to prepare Christendom as the temple of God for the return of Christ. The struggle is, whether the things seen shall abide, or the things unseen be revealed—whether the throne of man’s dominion shall deny or express that Jesus is Lord—whether the world shall groan under

the tyranny of Antichrist, or rejoice in the rule of Christ. The days of oppression by the perversion of God's ordinances are well-nigh past; the worse oppression by man's ordinances is to come; and to the eye that looks out for some refuge of God's building, the chief object on the dark horizon is the rising temple of lies. The spirits of darkness, content to have their very existence denied if thereby they may more securely work, are abroad in every province of man's being and occupation—amusing the idle, helping the industrious, instructing the scientific, pleading for the oppressed, exposing the weakness and fault of all things, and using the very longings of men after unity to decoy them into the confederacies of Antichrist. False Christs—who promise deliverance from evil without departure from sin—false paracletes—heralds and earnest of a false millennium—shall make counterfeits of every stamp of God, and, to the eye of flesh, outdo the messengers of Him who saith, "Repent, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." Power from the people, religion from man, shall prevail. The Tzebaoth shall arrogate the worship of their Lord; and Antichrist—whose rise at the end of the Christian dispensation in a form which the Papacy never presented has been foreshown by Hippolytus, De Lyra, Toussaint, and many others—by fathers and martyrs from the beginning—by witnesses of God at every great crisis in the history of the Church—he shall one day stand revealed as the head under whom all wickedness shall be recapitulated, and shall, like his type Napoleon, claim body and soul.

For this consummation Christendom has been preparing by the sins of many centuries. "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht:" "the history of the world is its judgment." "Curses always come home to roost." God will not bring down a judgment to which the sin has not been commensurate. He is not unwise, to inflict a judgment unlike the sin. He gives to all the fruit of their doings. It is because Christendom has nursed in its bosom every form of offence against the person, the holiness, the truth, the government, the grace, and the glory of Christ, that from her shall proceed the monster who shall sum up the whole. The Christian apostasy shall consummate the evil that is in the world, for none but they who have known Christ can thoroughly deny Him. If we could trace the invisible as the visible, the history of Christ's sufferings in Judea might find its ample parallel in the history of those acts by which the Christian Church has vexed, quenched,

and blasphemed the Spirit of Christ. Him who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, these Antichrists who abide not in the Father and the Son will blaspheme. The apostates shall be sent alive into the pit. And, if we would escape the judgment, we must escape their snare, by help of the eye-salve of Christ. We must stand fast in the common and original faith, rejecting and denouncing all alien to it; we must, with fasting and tears, implore our God not to remember our offences—nor the offences of our forefathers—but to spare His people; to raise up His power, and come among us, and with great might succour us; to “vouchsafe unto His Church the ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers; to unite and carry onward to perfection all His saints;” and to make us “fit and ready for the appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ.”

In connection with this subject, the following words of a living German divine are well worthy of transcription: “The Church is at present contained in the State, and ought so to be; yet such a condition is the fruit, not of necessity, but of sin; not because the theory of her constitution requires it, but because such is the will of the Lord. She serves, because she has deserved to serve. It is good that she should know this, and humbly submit to it; but let her not be required to renounce the very remembrance that she is the free-born daughter of a great King, and that her present condition is one of servitude. Let not her relation to the State be called one of unity, but rather one of subjugation—in hope. It is the time of her fasting for the absent Bridegroom, when she may well complain, as in the Psalms—‘We see not our signs, and there is no more any prophet or teacher.’ The highest gifts of the Holy Ghost—the apostolic and prophetic—are taken from her; therefore she is scattered: and, without support from herself, she can do no better than lean upon the powers of this world. And woe to those who, impatient and arbitrary, would tear the Church out of this bondage! Many have attempted it, giving themselves forth as apostles and paracletes, but being really deceivers, fanatics, and false prophets. History has judged them. Yet let not the Church be comforted by proving to her that things could not be otherwise than they are, and by requiring of her to be satisfied with everything, and to cease her sighs, and prayers, and hopes of deliverance. Shall this deliverance ever arrive within the bounds of this dispensation, and before the Lord Himself do come? Shall there ever be a time when the Church shall be governed by

Apostles, whom He has sent? Who has the boldness to affirm this? And yet it is certain, that till then there can be no true unity of Church and State, in mutual recognition, freedom, and love. But while we venture not to affirm that she shall be so governed, as little dare any man venture to deny it. And all those theories are to be rejected as erroneous which imply the impossibility that the Church can in this age be set free by the restoration of the Apostolic gifts. Such theories fix the Church in the elements of the world, and assume that their present unnatural condition is her original and natural one." Again—"They who at present have power over the Church should be ready at any moment to resign the power which they possess over her into the hands of the Lord, or of them whom He shall send." And again—"The Apostolic office which binds the whole Church into a unity, is at present, in the counsel of God, a place left vacant, into which no man can intrude *himself*, save by error or deceit. Yet although this key-stone of the Church, which would put the finish to its organization, is wanting, there will ever be an unconscious effort in the Church to fill up the blank, and to bring forth out of herself an inferior organization of similar character, when unable to attain the superior." This last-mentioned tendency in the Church—namely, to provide herself with a lower and wholly inadequate form of that for which she should wait on God till He bestow it—is one pregnant with danger to the whole Church, and especially to its German branch. Impatience, the fruit of zeal without corresponding faith in the zeal of the Lord of Hosts, has throughout marred the blessing of God. So Adam fell; so Sarah got Ishmael; so Moses failed to deliver; so Saul lost the kingdom; so would the Church have Apostles of men, instead of Apostles of Christ. By a wonderful working of God, while some civil rulers are striving wholly to enslave the Church, the hearts of others have been disposed towards granting to her the liberation for which she longs. But it must ever be remembered that legislation, in the way of ecclesiastical guidance by the State, proceeding from the wrong source, only aggravates the evil which it proposes to remedy; and—on the other hand—if to be set free means to be turned adrift in the world at the mercy of wind and wave, better far that the Church were always a bondmaid. It is the "government of the Universal Church in the right way" that makes her truly free, and renders other guidance needless. That blessing is to be obtained, not by hasty assertion or concession of liberty,

but by patient faith, intelligent prayer, and conscientious labour. There must be faith in the way of God's working, ere He can work—"Μοις γαρ ημιν ηλιος και φεγγος ελαφον εστιν οσοι μεμνημεθα." And no one of us has yet been so faithful in little as to be worthy of being entrusted with much.

The "Free Church of Scotland"—which, though abstractly commendable for its jealousy of State interference and its solicitude to meet the desires of a Christian people, has, in its reckless vindication of personal liberty, sacrificed the rights of the priesthood at the shrine of popularity, as others have at that of power, and which plumes itself on its narrow orthodoxy and naked ritual—may well draw a lesson from a German divine, who looks for the *liberation* of the Church through the restoration of *Apostolic* gifts.

As to the Church of England, her day is past—her good things have done their work—her liturgy is now too narrow for the faithful, and too stringent for the faithless. Latent diversities are developed into schisms. In spite of the cry for unity, the rising floods drive men farther apart; each treats his friend as if he might one day be an enemy; and for the healthy rotundity of Catholic truth and forms, each would substitute the acute angles of his own system and manner. The Evangelical party—long Dissenters in conduct and feeling—now triumphantly proclaim their sentiments as those of the Church herself, and denounce as Popish every true ecclesiastical principle and practice. The zealous Churchman, seeing no further than "England for the English," would rival, not aid—would debar, not welcome, Greece and Rome; and, while he would gladly see a multiplication of Anglicanism, cannot comprehend a catholic ministry of which England shall but share the blessing. In Oxford, the priestly—in Cambridge, the diaconal—among the masses, the popular element—assume exaggerated forms. The Tractarians—loyal, not to their diocesans, but to their own ideas of ecclesiastical principles—outrun, reprove, and teach the bishops of the Church, without any commission—without the thought or pretence of Apostolic authority—so to do. Of the bishops—surprised at being again called really to guide the Church—some are pitted against each other, others united in helpless neutrality—a feeble rallying-point for those not yet appropriated by any faction. In the House of Lords, their mouths are stopped by the condition on which they hold their seats, as temporal though not lay

peers. And while ecclesiastical courts] by their judgments extract and reject from the Anglican ritual the very kernel of Christian mysteries, the bishops allow their consent to be inferred from their silence. Among the clergy few really enjoy episcopal government, counsel, and countenance. Of the laity, the great mass, who cannot be approached by the existing machinery of the Church, rapidly sink into worse than heathen ignorance and vice; and the elegantly religious play with a minister of Christ as with a toy, but will not bear reproof, or submit to guidance. The bishops are not singly competent to determine how they shall guide their clergy and people. They make confusion worse when they try it. They shrink from bringing dangerous elements into the explosive contact of a council. The old Convocation, if revived, would be found only a secular and most clumsy machine, unfit for the work required. Were a true ecclesiastical synod to meet, its right action would not be borne. The sacred authority of the bishops, profanely buffeted by every anonymous scribbler, is betrayed by their own clergy, and trampled down by the laity in the phalanx of open confederacy, and on the arena of rude debate. And one cannot avoid the sad conviction, that the day for complacent laudation of "our excellent Church and admirable formularies"—the day of devout wishes, that for centuries we may worship as for centuries we have done—is gone by. There may be ecclesiastical patriots, who, while unscrupulously rejecting ancient traditions, have nailed their colours to the mast of Reformation principles; as if these principles themselves had never been once counted innovation, and were now as infallible as Holy Writ and as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. Such men, refusing to part with their mere Church-of-Englandism, or to admit a ray of foreign light on what, with a boast and not a blush, they style their "home-spun" religion, will rather perish than capitulate. But if the Anglican Church is to be saved, she must cease to be Anglican. Her idolized Apostles' successors must both retreat into their due limits in order to make way for Apostles themselves, and rise to their true dignity, as angels of the Churches sustained by Apostles. They must be rejoined to the Christian priesthood by an authority and jurisdiction which, wherever located, shall be neither constituted by the Parliament, nor confined to the realm of England. She must give legitimate scope for manifestation of the Spirit, and instead of empowering churchwardens to quench the Holy Ghost as a brawler, rather

seek of God the offices and grace needful for the guidance of spiritual gifts. She must not be content with dictating to or neglecting her unrepresented population, but allow legitimate participation in her affairs to all her children. She must become zealous for the Lord, and not for herself; and seek His return, and not her own good name. Once enriched and adorned with the full blessing and gifts of Christ, she may well afford to let her revenues and snug parsonages, her ease and honours, go. But alas! ere this can be, and whenever she begins to act in good earnest, she will discover how entangled by a Parliamentary network, overlaid by wealth and power, and paralyzed by sloth and distraction, she is. Then will her perplexity come: the despair of the unguided—the bitter sorrow of those who guide the discordant—the pains and penalties of following the Lord. Satan will not passively yield the world. The saints cannot obtain the kingdom in a way of blandness and smiles. As Luther said, “Our spouse is a bloody husband unto us.” If the seed was sown with blood, so also shall the harvest be reaped. The work which the time demands is the only one which Satan withstands. On every other he smiles. But it must be done at the peril of fortune, fame, and life, without respite—with shame and sorrow to the end—with the sign of the prophet Jonas—the blackness of all but despair—till Christ Himself appear. Then they that sow in tears shall reap in joy. They know in whom they have believed. The truth is worth suffering for. “*Suorum paucitate contenta est, et multitudine hostium non terretur.*” Let us hold it in sincerity, and exhibit it in love.

νῦν ἀνομημα μὴ μόναν οἶν.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

1850.

PREFACE.

As a fool can ask a question which a wise man cannot answer, so can the wicked expose evils which the godly cannot remedy. It requires no great discernment to discover matter of accusation against the Church. But the office of accuser has nothing divine in either its source or its aim. And those times are ominous indeed, in which, while no one has power to help, every one has the will to accuse.

Most great social, moral, and religious questions are now disposed of among us, not ostensibly on their true merits, but, as it were, through algebraical formulæ, which deal with apparently insignificant exponents, and not with true values. Thus principles good and bad are renounced and established, with little feeling of responsibility; and men find themselves accordingly in the midst of results from which they would have shrunk, had they not willingly veiled them, and were it not too late to retract. The question of Anglican priesthood has been disposed of by a side wind under the colour of a vestment. That of Anglican episcopacy may shortly be settled by the arithmetic of revenues. That of the Eucharistic sacrifice has been settled under the rival symbols of wood and stone table and altar. The justification of the yet unrepentant people who brought Christ's blood upon them, against God's judgment, may soon be effected by a parliamentary oath. Religion may anon be banished from the earth by free trade in instruction; and in like manner the momentous question, who are members of Christ, and how, has been transmuted into a harmless archæological inquiry, whether the framers of certain documents, and the successive expounders of the same, intended to assert anything about baptism which should make its opposite a lie, or to enjoin any obedience which should make its opposite disobedience?

But this last is a vastly practical matter for the men, women, and children of England. For if that blessed sacrament, which is the *sine quâ non* to all Christian know-

ledge and virtue, discipline and victory, is, after all, such an amphibious thing that piety demands and humility allows no certainty about it, then are the ministers of Christ, who must deal with the people of England as they *are*, left to treat them as members of Christ or not, as they please, and to ascribe their membership to what they please. The landmark is removed, the fence trodden down, and the once fruitful but now for a long time barren field converted into a hopeless quagmire. And if, to be a member of Christ, one in nature, blessing, and dealing with the Son of God, be a position, the height of which surpasses all human comprehension, what can be more like the renouncing of our birthright, than such ignorance of it, and such indifference to it? To find Christ's sheep, or to prepare His Church for His return, starting from such a baseless dubiety as our new doctrine of baptism, is an absolute dream.

We may now see if we will what the spirit of Egypt, the ways of Babylon, the defilement of the temple, have brought us to. The judgment of God impending over the world, begins at His house, which shall judge the world. He has not beheld with indifference, neither will He leave unrequited, the substitution of natural powers and feelings, of Bibles, creeds, liturgies, traditions, and rites, of Pope, potentate and populace, of honourable lords made way for—of learned oracles consulted, of rich subscribers flattered, of patrons trusted in, of constitutions boasted in, of arguments marshalled, and majorities counted of worldly place and policy, for the true theology and theocracy. He now ariseth to save, and all this may no longer be. He bringeth in a kingdom which cannot be moved. And the things that can shall be shaken. Is it not the fact, that in the nineteenth century of our existence we have fallen back to the A B C of truth? When we should be ready as a prepared bride to meet the Lord, are we not debating as to what constitutes the Church? Is not the Anglican section, which boasts itself the most Apostolic, unable to tell what it believes of holy baptism? And do not its leaders discourage the search after certainty in the matter, as uncharitable conduct, an intrusion into things not revealed?

There are, indeed, pious persons who ascribe no sacramental efficacy to baptism. But the Church of England, while she admits that efficacy, cannot define it, and will not limit it to baptism. There are many religionists who reject priesthood; but she at once asserts it, and declines to maintain its proper functions. There are many who reject

divine forms of government; but while she asserts them in a pompous and expressive maintenance of gradation, she renounces their practical exercise.

A priest of the Church of England applies to the Primate for counsel; his application may be a trap for the Primate; it may be disrespectful and irregular, or it may not—but there it is. How does the Primate answer him? Does he say, “You don’t seek to be taught, but to teach, entrap, or concuss me”? Does he say, “You pass by your bishop,—I refer you to him”? No. He says, “I won’t teach you, but I will answer your questions. You want guidance; I give you mere truisms. You seek instructions in perplexity; here is a *‘superficial reply’* for you. You want light on doctrine and discipline; I show you how you may do your duty without knowing what you do, or why. You desire to present your flock perfect in Christ; you need only give them the necessaries of life—you ought not to give them more. And, as a climax to the whole, you ask me, as the guide to all the clergy, to lead you to the knowledge of the truth; I tell you that which is contained in the Word of God and can be proved thereby *‘you have the same means of discovering as myself, and I have no special authority to declare.’*”

Either all this is true or it is not. If it is the true representation of the case, then the Church of England, with her Apostolic succession and excellent standards, as they say, is utterly useless; she stands confessed as no pillar and ground of the truth, no house of the living God. And if it is not a true one, then what is the use of this Primate? Should he be any longer left at the head of the Church, yet without the means of guiding it? The reply is, indeed, most “superficial.” It is not the right answer to a dishonest inquirer; it is an insult to an honest one. It informs him of nothing; he knows all that already, before he put the questions. The answer is positive only in dubiety. When it ventures to leave the coast of written articles for the open sea, it is indeed at sea. It misapplies the Scriptures. It gropes in twilight as to the way of God. It confesses that the rite of Confirmation in the Anglican Church is not scriptural. It does not assert the divine origin and right of her orders. And if the Church really can and does assert positively as God’s truth no more than this answer represents, either her children must be starved, or her clergy must be resigned to every wind of doctrine and licence of practice in nourishing them.

But the Primate implies that the questions proposed to him are such as gender strifes; that they are not practical; and that if raised in the exercise of ministry, they would be a deviation from the simple "Word of God."

If by this is meant, that all truth which the ignorant do not acknowledge and the ungodly oppose must be avoided as gendering strife, or that Christian ministration should be a mere echo of texts, or a constant repetition of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, we at least understand him, although we cannot see how any ministry could be thus rightly fulfilled. But if anything more is meant, it is hardly conceivable that he can thus stigmatize the questions put to him. What are these questions? May I teach that infants are regenerated in baptism—that the Holy Ghost is given by the laying on of hands—that divine orders are essential, and that priests have power to forgive sins? Can any questions be supposed more essentially practical than these? A man, ministering unto mere heathen, could hardly avoid their solution. But what pastor over a flock of Christ, what priest among Christian worshippers, could contemplate his duty without desiring, or perform it without requiring, knowledge on these points? I cannot speak to men, and especially to children, without knowing whether to address them as regenerate or not. If I ought to obtain for my flock every Christian blessing, I must surely know whether the Holy Ghost is to be given or not; how, and by whom. I must know my own authority, and that of others, to minister. I must know whether I can absolve the penitent, lest I fail to relieve the burdened or rush into presumptuous acts. Yet all these things are idle, speculative, gratuitous, dogmatic questions—needless sources of strife, intrusions into secret things, neither found in, nor proved by, the Word of God—demands for dogmatic teaching without an emergent heresy—things for which one would not excommunicate dissentients! We can only reply, these are things which no healthy Christian congregation can live and grow without. And if these things demand to be so characterized, then the very existence, the spiritual desires and necessities, the unavoidable nourishment and discipline of Christian men, lie beyond the limits of this simple "Word of God," and should be abolished as presumptuous, unscriptural, nay, blasphemous trifles. No man, clerical or lay, can avoid seeking an answer to these questions, except by being spiritually asleep or dead.

Moreover, the Primate declines to teach. On what

ground? Not because he regards the instruction of individuals as foreign to his office, but, first, because every priest (and why not every man?) can discover for himself as well as the Primate what is contained in God's Word, and can be proved thereby; second, because the Primate has no special authority to declare what is contained in God's Word, and can be proved thereby. If this be so, why have we so long fondly lingered among such very expensive shams? Why have a Primate at all? why a Bishop? why a Pastor? Till now we always understood that the use of a pastor was to lead his people, and that of a bishop to lead his clergy better, further, and more surely than they could themselves in the knowledge and practice of the truth; till now we believed that the office and authority were of God; till now we believed that the grace of God went with the commission empowering each in his own sphere. But if all this is a huge mistake, do let us resist the infidel no longer. Let us hold up our pious hands no more in horror when we see everything broken down by the axes and hammers of the wicked. Let us rather, although from very different motives, exert ourselves as much as they to rid Christianity of this monstrous incubus, which with great parade and promise has too long overlain the Church.

To be serious—for the matter is a grave one. If the clergy of England come to the Primate for instruction, and he answers, None—if they come for commandments, and he answers, None—then we know, alas! where we are. The state ecclesiastical is bankrupt. The throne is abdicated. The ruin has come. And each exclaims, "Let it not be under my hand."

But with all this bankruptcy and abdication of subsisting things and persons on earth, it is not so with our Head at the right hand of power. Yet it may be asked, How is His grace to flow again? Where is His authority to be found? The Bishop says, "Through synodical action." Alas! alas! the projects of those faithful to confess the truth are utterly powerless to save. Let the Bishops but attempt a synod, or let a synod attempt to act; they will then feel what they have long industriously refused to see, that the Church of England, however honoured, is but a State prisoner, after all. The bands of earth and hell will be tightened upon her as soon as she struggles heavenward for liberty. She must cease to be the mere Church of

England, ere she can freely and rightly act as the Church of Christ. What right has an aggregate of units, calling itself synod or council, to assume Catholic rule? What right has a synod, usurping such rule, to rely on the grace and power of God? Who made the successors of Apostles Apostles? How can any number of men, each of whom is not an Apostle, constitute themselves an Apostolic college? Synods are the council of a head—of a head ordinance. If they assume to be more, they are mere democracy called aristocracy. But where is the head? Not the Pope. His elevation, the result in many respects beneficial of past circumstances, is past with them. He is but a substitute for those having universal mission. But universal mission he has not; and mission from above he has not. While bishops are not blessed by the greater, but by their equals, he is blessed only by his inferiors. Until those who have universal mission, and mission from above—until Apostles are acknowledged by the Church—until Primate, Bishop, and Synod take their place as counsellors of Apostles, and are constituted in a more perfect way than heretofore,—they will only be the mouth-pieces of strife, not the restorers of peace and blessing.

The root of the evil lies in two things—the sin of the Church as a body, and the want of catholic divine government in the Church herself. It is not the sin of the Primate that he gives childish answers to grave questions, composes unliturgical prayers, and throws down, with confession of impotence, the reins of government. Where faith is not in the body, the head cannot bless; where obedience is absent, the head cannot rule; where the love of holiness is not, the head cannot sanctify. Christ is among us indeed, but as a mighty man that cannot save. But if the whole body, or any in the unity, and on behalf of the whole body, not of a mere Anglican section, will confess our common sin, knowing wherein it lies, and will seek the common blessing, knowing what it is, God will turn from His wrath, and cause the waters to flow again. Apostles shall be sent to the Church, not only to restore her ruins, but to make her the pillar and ground of the truth, and to refresh with the ministration of the Spirit God's weary heritage. We shall not need to exaggerate a bishop into a usurper, or to invite a king to intrude into the house of God. The candlestick of Christ, now in peril of being removed from us, shall be furnished with fresh oil, trimmed

and lighted afresh; and shall give light to all around, not as the Church of England, or of England's King, or of England's Parliament, but as the One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church in this land and among this nation.

The following is a short exposition of the conditions, nature, and fruits of Holy Baptism, for the present instruction and comfort of the faithful.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY BAPTISM.

OUR blessed Lord said to His disciples, "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. I am the vine, ye are the branches: He that abideth in me, and I in him, bringeth forth much fruit. In this is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit." (John xv. 1—8.) And He prayed, "Glorify thy Son, that thy Son also may glorify thee." (John xvii. 1.) From these words we learn that the resurrection and ascension of Christ brought Him into that condition in which, as our Head, He could glorify the Father by our holiness, and that we must be to Him as the branch to the vine in order to be holy as He is holy. It is, therefore, a question of vital importance, who are branches of the true vine, how they became so, and what their position implies.

As we read the text, they are branches of the vine who have the nature of the vine, who are one with it, who possess its life, and share its nourishment—in other words, who are partakers of the divine nature, (2 Pet. ii. 1, &c.), who are one with the Son as He with the Father, (John xvii. 22,) who are born again, (John iii. 3,) and who being in Christ are subjects of all the grace of God. (Eph. i. 19; v. 29.)

They become branches of the vine by an act of God. As men we did not beget ourselves. Neither did God beget us through our act. As little can we beget ourselves anew. As little does God beget us anew by our act. We can believe in God—we can know Christ—we can come to Him, being enlightened and drawn by the Father; but we cannot make ourselves members of Christ—we cannot graft ourselves into the vine. No change in our spiritual feelings can change our being or our place. Our spiritual condition may accord with, or be at variance with, our being and our place, but it can neither alter nor create them. God may invisibly change our feelings, but He does not invisibly change our being or place. He does the latter by

a visible act; and without that visible act, we cannot be a new thing or occupy a new place.

The branches of the vine ought to bear the fruit of the vine, and no other. The fruit is of the root, but is seen in the branches. And the branches ought to bear no fruit of their own. In other words, we ought to show all the holiness and power of Christ, and no longer show the works of fallen Adam.

The Sacrament of Baptism with water, performed by one appointed of God, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, makes us members of Christ. Others may believe in Christ, but the baptized alone are His members.

Let us, then, inquire—

1. Who are the fit subjects of Baptism.
2. What they receive therein.
3. What are their duties as baptized.

I. We know that all men are sprung of Adam, and are in him fallen and accursed. We also know that the Son of God, equal with the Father, having by the Holy Ghost become partaker of our fallen nature, yet being in Himself neither fallen nor accursed, but holy and blessed, did, in the stead of all men, perfectly serve God in His life, and endure God's curse in His death; that He bore our sins in His own body on the tree, and after thus making an end of sin, and blotting out our guilt, was, by His resurrection and ascension, delivered from our fall and curse, and did thereby deliver us, opening for all men the way into the holiest. This fact is the subject of the Gospel. It is to be preached to all fallen in Adam, for the obedience of faith. They who for themselves believe this fact, and repent or turn to God, are to be baptized: and by baptism they are made God's children, and Christ's disciples. They are, by an act of God's power, placed in a new relation to Him, and are truly fitted to learn, to receive, and to do all that Christ imparts to and enjoins on His Church through His Apostles (Matthew xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 46). Such is the order of God's work. First, the incarnation of Christ, then His death, resurrection, and ascension to the right hand of power; then the preaching of the Gospel, the turning of the hearer, and his baptism into Christ, by which last he is admitted to participate in all which the Church knows, receives, enjoys, and does. As turning to God implies previous estrangement, so does baptism imply that previous turning. And as baptism implies a previous turning, so does the blessing enjoyed by the Church imply previous baptism.

What, then, is the warrant for baptism? In answering this question we must hold fast two fundamental truths. 1st. That previous holiness is not the proper warrant for it. 2nd. That previous unholiness does not debar from it.

As to the first, let us define what is meant by holiness. It may mean those various degrees and forms of knowledge, love, and obedience towards God, which all saints in every dispensation have exhibited, and which have been seen even in the heathen, who, though not in covenant with God, have yet showed the work of the law written in their hearts. (Rom. ii. 15.) Such a holiness corresponds in every case to the man's position and means of knowledge. Or else holiness means that wonderful fellowship with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that renewal or re-creation in the image of Christ which are peculiar to the Church as one Spirit with Him—perfect in Him, His body and feelings, the temple of the Holy Ghost, the joint heir of Christ's throne;—a condition which could not exist till Pentecost, which cannot be seen save in the baptized. This holiness also corresponds to our position. It is a holiness without parallel, because the position is without parallel. If the former holiness is meant, it is indeed a preparation for receiving the blessing which baptism conveys. The law is for the Jew his schoolmaster to bring him to Christ. And among the heathen, such as Cornelius, whose prayers and alms were accepted before God, are the men whose hearts God has prepared to know and love His Christ when preached to them, and to receive the blessing which God bestows in baptism. Unless men believe that Christ is the true God and eternal life, they never will come to receive His life through baptism. God does not baptize unbelievers, He does not thrust eternal life upon the unwilling. Faith is the condition of baptism, but previous holiness is not. The man who turns to God from his sins, is as much accepted as the strictest Jew or the purest heathen. A man is baptized not because he is holy, but because, being born in sin, he believes and expects to be delivered therefrom by baptism. On the other hand, if the latter holiness is meant, it cannot be the condition of baptism, because it can exist only in the baptized. If none are to be baptized who are not already, independently of baptism, all that which they are to become by baptism, then baptism is either impossible or worthless,—impossible, if the fruit is to be seen before the tree; worthless, if the fruit can be seen without it. It may be a testimony, human or divine, to something

which is already there; but it operates, creates, conveys nothing.

In like manner, if the warrant for baptism is not previous holiness, but faith in the Holy One, then previous sin is no bar to baptism. All sin is the fruit and expression of our standing in fallen Adam. Baptism saves us not merely from wrath, but from sin. It saves us from sin not by an act which leaves unaltered our standing in fallen Adam, but by an act of God's power which takes us out of that standing into another, and thus delivers us from the sin of the one, and introduces us into the holiness of the other. We read that, in baptism, "we are buried with Christ, in order that, as he was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we may walk in newness of life:" and again, that "the old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin, for he that is dead is freed from sin." . . . And we are exhorted thus, "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, and alive unto God in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. vi. 4—11.) If, then, the Sacrament of Baptism be that act appointed of God, whenever His power is present, to deliver us, not only from curse, but from sin, not only from actual sins, but from original sin, from that fallen condition of which actual sins are but the necessary fruit and constant expression,—then to say that previous sin is a bar to baptism, is not only to cut off all men from the blessing of that Sacrament, and to render their admission into the Church of Christ impossible, but it is also to stultify that Sacrament itself, and to rob it of its very essence and true operation.

But we have said that while holiness is not the warrant for baptism, and sin is not a bar to it, faith is its indispensable pre-requisite. Now what are we to understand here by faith? The circumstances in which faith is here required afford the answer. The faith here demanded is the divine persuasion that Christ is the life, and that baptism is the door to that life. More is not required. Faith is always essentially the same. It is apprehension and confidence. Its object may vary. It may be faith in God or in man. It may be directed to that on which it should rest, or to that on which it should not. It may be divine or human in its origin and object. But the attitude is the same throughout. When directed to God, its origin is divine, and its object unchangeable. But though God be its unchangeable object, it must correspond to the mode and measure in

which He presents Himself as its object. The form which it assumes, and the acts to which it tends, vary with the measure of the divine revelation, and with the character of the divine dispensation. Wherever He presents Himself to faith, there faith meets Him. But the character and action of faith depends on the circumstances in which He does so. God asks not of us to take any step, active or passive, without faith. But the faith which He gives and requires, as it is no less, so also it is no more than faith sufficient to take the step. The faith required for baptism is indeed much more than mere abstract faith in God. It is more than mere faith in Christ as a divine messenger. It is more than mere faith in Him as a divine Person. It is more than mere faith in Him as the sacrifice for our sins. It is more than mere faith in Him as our Advocate with the Father. It is faith in Him as the second Adam, to whom the Father hath given to have life in Himself, and who is invested with power to give it unto us,—faith that life is to be found in Him,—faith in God's will and power to graft us into Him by baptism,—faith in the presence of the Holy Ghost to regenerate us through water,—faith in God's presence with the hand and lips of His minister;—and all this coupled with a true sense of sin, a true estimate of life eternal, and a true longing for it. It is all this. But it is not more, for more is not required; nay, more is not possible without the previous reception of baptism. The faith goes as far as the object presented to it. It need not, it cannot, go further. It is not required that we shall share in the mysteries, or have the experience which the perfect in Christ alone can share and have. It is not required that we shall intellectually understand all theology. It is not required that we shall have proved our faith by walking with God, as they alone can do who already dwell in God, and He in them. No more is required than that the eye shall look to the right quarter, and that the heart shall desire the blessing.

Yet, if faith is the condition of baptism, should not baptism be withheld from infants? Certainly, if infants neither have nor can have faith. But is this the case? First let us look to Christ Himself. He was made in all things like unto us. He grew in wisdom and stature, in favour with God and man. His faculties were developed in infancy like those of any other infant. He lived by faith like any other man; and of Him it is said, that He hoped while on His mother's breasts. (Ps. xxii. 9.) Secondly, let

us consider Jeremiah, who was sanctified from the womb. (Jer. i. 5.) And who is so without faith? Thirdly, let us consider John the Baptist, of whom it is said, that he should be filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb. (Luke i. 15.) Lastly, let us seek an answer to the question in the very principles of man's being. An infant, although undeveloped, is as perfect in all its parts as a man. It has a heart. That heart no man can search. If infants can have faith at all, no man can say of any one that it has not faith. And the thing required is not that it can show its faith, but that it shall have it. The ground of exclusion, then, must be the general one, that all infants are incapable of faith. Now what do those understand by faith who make such an assertion? If they mean the intellectual apprehension of adults, the assent to propositions, the exercise of logic, the comprehension of creeds and catechisms, no doubt infants have no faith. But are such things faith? They have nothing to do with it. They are the work of the intellect. As such they are acceptable before God, provided the intellect be subordinated to the spirit of man, and the spirit of man be in communion with God. But if the spirit be estranged from God, or if the intellect, an inferior part of man's threefold being, usurp the first place, dethrone man's spirit, and sit in judgment upon God, all such exercises of the intellect are displeasing to God, and are only the more so that they are directed to divine things.

The intellect is a mere mechanical power, which man, abiding in Christ, can use to the glory of God. But it is not by the intellect that man believes in God. Faith in the heart must introduce the intellect to the things of God. When this is not so, the intellect is a profane intruder, and may be exercised upon the things of God by an apostate as well as by a saint. The infant, although its intellect be unfruitful, has a spirit as capable of faith and divine communion as the oldest or wisest man. The communion of an adult, whose intellect is sanctified and subordinate, is indeed fuller than that of an infant; but that of an infant is vastly greater than that of the deepest unsanctified theologian. The one is in a right position towards God, the other in a wrong one. The more the latter knows, the worse is his case, and the more groundless is his boast over the sucking child. Is it conceivable that God should bring into being an originally intelligent creature, perfect in all its parts, yet incapable of holding communion with Him till it has attained

a certain age, or rather, an uncertain one? If so, God is the author of sin. Where the creature *can* hold communion with God and *will* not, the sin lies with the creature; but if that communion is by God's act impossible, the creature is guiltless. If faith is, in the adult, not the offspring of the intellect, but its guide, why should this want of intellect in a child debar the child from faith? It is only the pride of man which dictates such a thought. He will not admit of faith where he cannot boast of judgment. But is not man regenerated by means of water? Is not his new life sustained by means of bread and wine, entirely independent of intellect, and in a way which it cannot grasp? Can he by taking thought add one cubit to his stature? And if the highest mysteries of the Church are inaccessible to intellect, and the mightiest acts of God independent of it, why should the undeveloped condition of that faculty which, although it were there, and developed, could not commune with God, render faith in an infant's heart impossible? If, then, the infant is capable of faith, it can fulfil the condition of baptism as well as the adult.

Yet it may be said, although the infant is capable of faith, are we to believe that it has faith? The answer to this question is equally clear. God never brings any creature into any situation without putting at the command of that creature the faith necessary to act aright therein. All children are born in sin, and exposed to the curse. The children of Christian parents are not holy by birth because their parents are holy. They are purged and sanctified by baptism, to which end the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the wife by the husband, in order that the act of faith performed by one parent, in bringing the child to baptism, may be imputed to the other also. (1 Cor. vii. 14.) Now if parents cannot with certainty bring their children to baptism, for deliverance from sin and death, how dare they become parents? But if baptism is such a deliverance, is it not the duty, as well as the privilege, of parents to bring them? If in doing so they do their duty, can we believe that God will not bless their deed? And if, in the providence of God, the infant is brought to baptism by its parents, or others, can we believe that He will withhold His grace? Are there two Gods—the God of providence and the God of grace—whose objects are diverse, whose acts are at variance? Is not one God the God of both? Does He not order all wants, as well as impart all blessings? Will He order the one, and yet withhold the

other? He does not mock His children. He does not put it into the hearts of parents to offer their children, only to reject the offering; or to seek a blessing, only that He may deny it. The Holy Spirit is not lawless and arbitrary. As He does not speak of Himself, so does He not work for Himself. He fulfils the will of God. He follows the ordinances of Christ. The adult conceives the faith needful unto baptism by hearing the preached Word; but it was the providence of God which brought him in contact with that Word. And God is faithful to bestow on any one who hears the Word the gift of faith. So does the providence of God order not only that the infant shall be born, but that it shall be born of such parents, or be found in the hands of such others, as will bring it to the font. In both cases the faith must come from God. Neither the preacher nor the parent can bestow it. But in both cases God is faithful to bestow it. As He prepares the heart of the hearer, so does He prepare the heart of the child. And while brought by others, it comes in faith, although it can neither walk, nor speak, nor reason.

For all this we have many analogies, of which we shall select one from the province of nature, and the other from that of grace. 1. If the Christian should always abide in conscious faith, what becomes of him in sleep? Then his intellect is inactive, and if intellect be indispensable to faith, in sleep he can have no faith. But dare we so think? Does our communion with God cease; do we cease to abide in Christ when we sleep? If so, who that fears God would dare to sleep? Still more, how dares he voluntarily dispose himself to sleep, and ask God's blessing on a condition in which his communion with, and faith in, God are interrupted? Whatsoever is not of faith is sin. Every moment of our existence without faith is sin. If faith ceases when sleep begins, sleep is not only a negative evil, but a positive sin. 2. In 1 Cor. xiv. we are told that he who speaks with tongues ought not to speak in the church without an interpreter, because he does not fructify the understandings of others in that place where the sanctified understanding ought to be in exercise. But we are also told that when he exercises that gift in private, his own understanding is as little fructified by it as that of the hearers in the church. Yet so far from being forbidden to use in private a gift which in no way informs his understanding, he is encouraged to use it in private. And why? Because in so doing he not only glorifies God, speaking mysteries to him, but *also edifies*

himself. (1 Cor. xiv. 4.) Hence we see that even an adult who can understand is edified when he does not understand. Instead of having no faith in a communion with God, because he does not understand what he speaks, his communion is of the most intense character. Yet he is for the time as destitute of intellect as the infant.

There are two distinct classes of persons who agree in denying faith to infants, but who, while they agree in this, are diametrically opposed to each other both in their principles and in their conclusions. The one class, as already seen, deny baptism to infants because they say that faith is necessary, and that infants cannot have it. The other class grant baptism to infants, because they say that which is required for baptism is not active faith, but passive capacity, and that infants can have—nay, always have—the latter. They say that the adult who believes the preached Word, and repents of his actual sins, although he has an active faith and desire, has also a passive capacity, because the less grace is included in the greater; that this passive capacity is all that is required for the baptism of any, and that infants, having it, are as much fit for baptism as adults. But this passive capacity presupposes the absence of any personal hindrance to the reception of grace. Actual sin, they say, would be such a hindrance. Adults must repent of their actual sins before they have that passive capacity. Therefore the ground for acknowledging such a capacity in infants is alleged to be that infants have not yet committed actual sin, from which it follows that baptism, instead of being delayed because infants are not fit to receive it, ought to be hastened, lest they become unfit to receive it, by actual unrepented sin. They are to receive baptism as being those who are yet without sin.

Of these two views, the latter, although apparently the more orthodox, is in reality the more erroneous and dangerous. In the first place, it is a denial of our true standing to say that God gives spiritual blessings, and fulfils promises to merely passive recipients. He that merely does not refuse cannot accept. If he did, it would be a work of magic, not of grace. Active faith is indispensable. Secondly: Children are born in original sin. If they are without sin at baptism, when and how has this original sin been taken away? If it be replied that their original sin has not been taken away, we ask, how can original sin exist without producing actual sin? It is the universal barrier between man and the kingdom of Christ. Their actual sins

can be pardoned, but their original sin is their standing in fallen Adam, at utter variance with a standing in Christ. And actual sin in fallen man is not an accident unconnected with his state, but the inevitable result of his descent from Adam. Original sin is not an old tradition about the fall of Adam, without confirmation in history or relation to living persons. It is the actual corruption of our whole being from the beginning hitherto in all men. And if the very being of an infant is corrupt, how can it avoid sinning from the beginning of its life? From its beginning it feels and acts. The feelings and actions of a fallen nature must be sin. Either it is left to itself by God, or it is not. If it is left to itself, it cannot avoid sin, but by avoiding any token of life. Its very continuance in being is an offence against the holy will of God concerning man. On the other hand, if it is not left to itself, there is God's grace; and if God's grace is there, there also must be faith. So much for the principle. But what does experience say? Is there any age too early for an infant to show faith in its mother? Is there any too early for it to offend against its mother? And is not offence against its mother sin against God? Are its little passions sinless because it cannot show them by murdering its mother, as Cain did Abel? To say this would indeed betray ignorance as to the essence of sin. Every cry which it utters, save as the mere expression of suffering or demand for help, is an actual sin, a fruit of original sin, a forfeiture of its supposed claim as a creature yet sinless to holy baptism. If infants are to receive baptism because they are sinless, we must either deny original sin, or believe that it has been already removed, or presume that it has not yet been acquired, or else maintain that a corrupt being can, left to itself, avoid sinning with the first breath it draws. Alas! it is to be feared that the first theory is the most general, and that at a time when the standing of the Church in the second Adam is so little known, the stature and effects of the standing of all men in the first Adam are actually forgotten. Neither let it be said that the children of faithful parents are born without original sin. The faith of parents who are themselves in a body of sin and death, does not remove the original sin of their offspring. As well might their baptism suffice as a substitute for that of their offspring. There are not two seeds of men born after the flesh—the holy seed of the holy, and the sinful seed of sinners. The blessing derived from faithful parents lies not in the exemption of

their children from original sin, but in their readiness to bring those children to that font wherein it shall be washed away. But, lastly, baptism is described in Holy Scripture not only as our transference out of the first Adam into the second, but as the actual forgiveness of actual *sins*. And in the creed we confess one baptism for the remission of *sins*. It is admitted that this applies to adults. If it does not also apply to infants because they have committed no sins, then baptism ought not to be given to them until we are assured that they have.

So far from infants being entitled to baptism because they have not sinned, that fact would take them out of the class for whom baptism is meant. If their old man be dead already, or not yet in being, how can he, and why need he, be buried with Christ?

Faith, then, is in all men alike the condition of baptism ;— in the adult conjoined with developed intelligence, in the infant apart from intelligence. Therefore does the minister in this latter case address not the sponsors, but the child, when he says, “ Wilt *thou* be baptized into this faith ? ” for here the faith of the child is the thing required. And therefore do the sponsors answer, for here intelligence is required, and they have the intelligence, and they believe that the child has the faith, because they know that the child has been brought to baptism according to the will of God, and that God is faithful in His ways.

Indeed, it may well be doubted whether they who refuse baptism to infants do really believe that baptism is regeneration to any. Although they profess to say no more than that adults alone can have the requisite faith or demonstrate its presence, yet, in requiring this intellectual demonstration of its presence, they really demand in adults a great deal more than the faith requisite to baptism. They really demand the same intelligence and holiness as is or ought to be found in those already baptized, and in them alone. With their inadequate apprehension of the distinct and superior standing of the Church, they see no distinction between the spiritual condition of a faithful member of the Church, and that of a faithful heathen. Instead of regarding faith as the means of receiving the blessings to which we are introduced by baptism, they substitute faith for baptism. They overlook the sacrament. They maintain that we are joined to Christ by a condition of mind called faith, and not by an act of God. And as faith is the same attitude of the heart in baptized and unbaptized, they regard the being and

position of both as the same. Hence baptism is with them either no regeneration at all, or a regeneration otherwise possible and previously wrought. In short, with however high-sounding words they may describe it, it is, after all, no more than a divine recognition, or at most a *confirmation* of grace already possessed; no real exercise of creative power, no change of standing, no gift of life in Christ.

II. The second question is, What is received in Baptism?

All men in fallen Adam are, when left to themselves, under the power of the god of this world. They may be devil-possessed. And where they are devil-possessed, exorcism finds its place as a preliminary to baptism. The unclean spirit must be expelled before they can be grafted into Christ, and fitted to be the temple of the Holy Ghost. Yet although the unbaptized are all fit habitations for devils, they are not all actually inhabited by devils. With the majority of men, this is prevented by the mercy of God. But although all are not devil-possessed, and many may have a fear of God in their hearts, none have the life of God in Christ. That they receive in baptism. Baptism is the gift of eternal life, and none can be grafted into Christ without receiving it. As the Fathers say, they have in it the remission of sins, the escape from sins by escaping from the nature which sins, the washing away of sins. They are brought out of the darkness into light by being grafted into Him who is the light. They are born again in the second Adam by His resurrection from the dead. They are made new unto God. And as the waters of the flood saved Noah, so do the destruction of our old man, and the creation of our new man form parts of one act. (1 Pet. iv. 21.) But the gift is not indefeasible. The life is not indestructible. It is not maintained without faith. It can be destroyed by exposure and lack of maternal nurture, even as natural life can. The spiritual mother may be careless or cruel. The child may be forward. This eternal life, though bestowed, can be forfeited through unbelief. The baptized are brought into that position in which they can be, and ought to be, holy as He is holy in whom they are. This they are to be, not merely through general faith in Christ's atonement, but through special faith in the act performed by God in their baptism; as it is written, "Reckon ye yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Rom. vi. 11.) He who does not thus reckon of himself cannot be holy; he who does not thus reckon of his children, or his flock, cannot with all his efforts make

them holy. When the work wrought in baptism and the consequent standing of the baptized is not believed, all effort, all prayer, all discipline, all instruction, are destitute of their proper basis. He who, while he ought to regard his children or his flock as already children of God, continually regards and treats them as aliens who are yet to become children by a change of heart, starts from a falsehood and cannot reach the goal. If the children of God are to be made obedient children, it cannot be by forgetting that they are His children, but by remembering and reminding them of the blessing and responsibilities peculiar to children. If we are not branches of the vine, why should the fruit be required of us? The life is given in baptism; it is nourished, or if departed, is revived, not by those who deny its gift, but by those who acknowledge it. The baptized are called to keep their place, not to win it; to improve a talent, not to obtain it; to use a trust, not to earn it. *Opere operato* are they baptized. But the measure of their blessing depends on the measure of their faith and obedience—in short, on their yielding to God's discipline. Of the branches, although all alike in place and privilege, there are two classes—branches in Christ that bear fruit, and branches also in Christ that bear not fruit. The former the Father purgeth, that they may bear more fruit; the latter He cutteth off—not man, but He—not in man's time, but in His—not in man's judgment, but in His. When the ministry of grace in the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, and in every ordinance, is withheld through unfaithfulness in the ministry, or impeded through unfaithfulness in the Church, the life will become sickly and distorted; if not restored, it will die. Now are we put on our trial whether we will be the heirs of Christ or no; whether, with infallible means of victory, we will overcome through faith or no; whether we will fulfil or frustrate the grace of God. (Heb. iii. 6; 1 John v. 4; Gal. ii. 21.) It is a trial of faith to the end, and when the hour of judgment comes—not the last day, but the time when judgment begins at the house of God—when he that hath receives more, and he that hath not loses that which he hath. Then comes the cutting off of the fruitless. Then comes the second death, which can overtake none but those who have been delivered from the first, and which supplants the second life. Then comes the strong delusion sent from God that they all may be judged and believe the lie, who have not believed the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. (2 Thess. ii. 11.) All the world may

follow apostates, but none save baptized men can become apostates.

Eternal life is given through baptism, in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. As no man can confer eternal life upon himself, so can no man confer it on another. Man is the instrument; the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are the agents. What is done in their name by their minister is done by them. The Father draweth those who come to Christ, by His providence ordereth their approach, and by His power grafts them into Christ. The Son, having by the Father's gift life *in Himself*, and invested by the Father with power to give it unto us, quickens all who are grafted into Him by baptism. The Holy Ghost carries into effect the power of the Father, and conveys the gift of the Son. By this threefold operation we obtain a threefold blessing;—we are made the children of the Father, the members of the Son, the temple of the Holy Ghost.

Further: This eternal life is given by means of water. As they on whom the Apostles lay their hands are baptized, not only with the Holy Ghost, but with fire—*i.e.*, as they not only receive the power and seal of God's indwelling, but are also made a whole burnt-offering thereby—so they which are baptized are born not only of water, but of the Holy Ghost—*i.e.*, they are not only transplanted by an act of divine power out of the old Adam into the new, but they are furnished by divine grace with the attributes of the new; they have not only the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience to God. (1 Pet. iv. 21; John iii. 5.) The two are one in the intention of God; they are severed solely by the unfaithfulness of man. It is no wonder that the Church, having severed herself from Christ, should exhibit in every ordinance the severance of all that God has indissolubly joined together. To be baptized without wearing the image of Christ is a monstrous condition, of which God knows nothing—the fruit of unbelief alone. It were, indeed, a wonder if unbelief did not gender such monsters. By such a test we may measure its guilt. Nevertheless the word stands, that we are born again by water as well as by the Holy Ghost: not, indeed, by the water without the Spirit, but as little by the Spirit without the water—although the one be God Himself, and the other not even an animate creature. Such is the power of God, such is His rebuke on the proud intellect of man, that He imparts to us, though a lifeless creature, that to which all

wisdom and knowledge, all theology, all religious effort, cannot attain. The same God who has appointed water as His instrument, is faithful and true to send His Spirit as the agent.

But this life is not only imparted by means of water ; it is imparted through the will of God's minister, through the will of mortal man, to use water thus. The minister does not regenerate—God regenerates. We are born "not of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 13.) But God regenerates, not only by the use of an inanimate creature, but also by using the will and the hand of an intelligent autonomous and responsible being, who has faith so to serve God. The will of Christ is the will of a man. It is as much so as ours ; and the will of His minister to obey His command is one of His instruments. As the authority of His minister is His, so is the will of His obedient minister His. Therefore to those who say, "How dare we bind the Holy Ghost, who is the Almighty God, and who worketh as He listeth, to the will and act of mortal and fallible man in regeneration?" we simply answer, that we do no such thing. Were the will of the minister no more than the will of a man, such an idea were indeed a blasphemy ; but where such an objection is made, is it not taken for granted that the will of the minister is indeed no more than the will of a man ? In other words, is it not assumed that Christ is not with His servants to the end of the world—that what they loose and bind on earth is not loosed and bound in Heaven, and that He does not any more fill all in all ? How could such a question be asked by any one in whom remains any spark of faith that Christ does any work in the Church at all ? It is the pure offspring and the sad test of unbelief. It degrades the Church from being the temple of the living God, to be a mere human society for the performance of blasphemous shams—the worse and the more blasphemous that they are done in the name of Christ. If baptism with water, even though performed for and in the name of Christ, is nevertheless a mere work of man and no act of Christ at all, it were indeed a blasphemy to bind the Holy Ghost to such an act. And it would be well indeed if all who claim authority, honour, and *reverence* in the Church would try themselves by this test, whether acts are to be regarded as the acts of Christ or not—whether they believe them to be so, and can assert that they are. The infidels would be in the right in making an end of the enormous forgery. But if baptism by

Christ's minister is indeed His act, then, so far from its being wrong to expect that the Holy Spirit shall bind Himself to the act of Christ's minister, it would be a blasphemy to deny it or expect the reverse. Does the Holy Ghost ever speak or act of Himself? As it is the mystery of Incarnation that Christ, though God, obeys the Father, is it not the very mystery of mission that the Holy Ghost is subservient to Christ? Is it not His very office to ratify and fulfil with blessing every act of Christ? Was He not sent for that very end? If water is God's instrument, the Spirit will work by the water; if the baptizer is God's minister, the Spirit will confirm his act. Wherever God appoints, there the Spirit acknowledges; wherever Christ acts, there He seals.

III. The third and last question is, What are the duties of the baptized?

They may be summed up in this: To receive from Christ all that He has received for us from the Father (John xvii. 2); to offer in Him all that He would offer through us to the Father; and to do on earth all that He would do through us.

The first duty of the baptized—not in order of time, but in order of economy—is to seek and receive the Holy Ghost in the fullest measure of His dispensation. In receiving Him who is the Comforter, in Christ's stead, we virtually receive all; and until we receive Him, the names of the adorable Trinity are not all declared in the Church. The name of the Father is declared as the object of worship and obedience; the name of the Son as pervading all rule and ministry; the name of the Holy Ghost bestowed and as manifested in the whole Church. By baptism we are made living members of one Christ—living stones of one temple; and our first duty is to seek the anointing of the Head, and the filling of the temple with God's presence. That anointing descends from the Man Christ Jesus, by the hands of men; the indivisible Spirit who inhabits the whole body, is bestowed by the hands of those men who are set over the whole, by the hands of Apostles. Being so bestowed, He manifests His pleasure and distributes His operations and gifts as it pleaseth Him. By this anointing, this baptism with the Holy Ghost, we know all things, being not made independent of teaching, but delivered from the teaching of man, and enabled to receive the teaching of God. By it we are knit together in one holy communion, filled with comfort and light, with joy and power, blessed with every legitimate form of mutual help, introduced to every form of

mutual sympathy. By it we have the power of God in prayer, the guardianship of God in all our ways, the wall of fire around us, and the glory in the midst. By it we are purified as gold and silver in the refiner's furnace, led willing captives unto Christ, carried down through the power of His Resurrection into the fellowship of His sufferings, made conformable unto His death, filling up that which lacketh of His sorrows. By it we have the earnest and the seal of our inheritance; by it we are kept from the hour of temptation, and armed for the last great conflict against the powers of hell; by it we shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and empowered with Him to condemn the apostates and to judge the world.

The next duty of the baptized is to be holy as Christ is holy, and nothing less. By baptism we are freed from sin through death in Christ. Our old man is crucified with Him; and if we abide in the grace of His Resurrection, which we receive in baptism, we keep ourselves as those born of God, and that wicked one toucheth us not (1 John v. 18); "for every one that is born of God doth not commit sin, because his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin: because he is born of God." (1 John iii. 9.) Abiding in Christ, we have the grace requisite to perfect holiness; and not one moment are we exempt from the duty, or deprived of the power, to abide in Him. Whether we wake or sleep, whether we rest or labour, whether we serve God in the world or worship in His house, He which saith, "Abide in me," saith also, "And I in you." This is our constant strength, our sure defence. If we do the one, keeping our baptismal grace, He will do the other by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost; and if He abide in us, where is the place for sin?

A further duty of the baptized is to keep the word of Christ's patience; not repining in this world, but biding His time; not judging, but interceding; not shunning the full fellowship of His travail, but willingly descending with Him to those depths in which He cried, "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" in order that we may partake of His full reward. For the sake of the joy set before us, we must endure the cross and despise the shame, and so behave ourselves that our entrance into His glory may be abundant, to the full extent of His promise.

Further: We must put on the whole armour of God, that we may escape that delusion which shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect; that we may witness, in every form

and degree, against any form and degree of Antichrist; that we may rescue our brethren as a prey from his grasp; that we may denounce the false Christ and be received by the true.

Further: It is our duty to worship God continually, and be always learning afresh of Him, though it may be to the shame of our former ignorance; bringing up, in every form and at every time appointed of Him, the honour and reverence due unto His name; labouring to know, to confess, and to fulfil the mystery of godliness.

Lastly: It is our duty to watch—waiting for our Lord with our loins girt and our lamps burning; awaking out of sleep, arousing from all sloth, kept from all distraction, pre-occupied with no work, and ready to see every preparation of His way set aside by His own appearing—for a short work will the Lord do; He will cut it short in righteousness—in an hour that we think not of will He appear.

THE ONE CATHOLIC SUPREMACY,
THE
DIVINE SALVATION OF THE CHURCH.

Second Edition—Enlarged.

1851.

THE ONE CATHOLIC SUPREMACY.

“That it may please Thee to rule and govern Thy Holy Church
Universal in the right way.”

THIS prayer, never yet fully answered, shall yet be answered in the Church on earth; and present events indicate its approaching answer. The now simultaneous outcry against Papal aggression, mixed as its motives are, is assuredly no mere popular frenzy, but has a deep origin, on the one hand in jealousy of Romish error, on the other in hatred of Romish truth. Nor is the present energy of the Papacy the mere flicker of an expiring light, or an anomaly absurd in this enlightened age. The tenacity of life in the Papal hierarchy, after assaults apparently mortal, arises not only from the divineness of its origin, but from its faith in that origin, and from its devotedness to a definite purpose. And its renewed efforts after usurped and misused dominion are but one form of that tyranny, temporal and spiritual, which in these last days shall reach its climax. For they have no right estimate of the times,—they are mere selfish conservatives, who regard open rebellion as the only form of Antichrist. The works of the flesh and the working of Satan are manifold. Lawlessness against Christ, in the most opposite forms, must come to the full. In the contest of potsherd with potsherd, tyranny and rebellion will have each its development; and Antichrist shall be seen, not only in the beast, but in the dragon and the false prophet,—not only in the perfect rejection, but also in the perfect prostitution of every divine ordinance.

Were the claim of Rome to be the centre of Christendom, and that of the Pope to Catholic supremacy, as well founded as they have often in past ages been beneficial, the Pope ought to regard all baptized men as his flock, whether they regard him as their shepherd or no. It is the principle of all government by divine right, that it does not cease with

the obedience of the governed. He cannot do less without a gross dereliction of duty,—without sinking to be the mere head of a sect,—without exhibiting either ignorance of his place, or the craft of a hypocrite. He may postpone his claims, but he cannot renounce them; least of all as to those who once admitted them. Therefore his communion is rejected wherever the sole authority usurped by him is denied; and in the absence of an umpire, the Protestant Churches,—so called, not because they are essentially diverse bodies, but because they are protesting parts of one body,—have singled out Rome to put her under ban, till she shall depart from claims by which she has singled herself out for proscription; claims to Catholic supremacy, which, although long a salutary substitute for that rule which Apostles should have exercised over the Bishops of Christendom, are yet in the end subversive of the harmony and destructive to the health of the body of Christ, because they are not the perfect way of God.

We need not judge our forefathers; we may presume that the enactments which fenced off the Anglican Church from Rome, and provided for a Protestant succession to the Crown (although in some of them the State usurped the functions of the Church), were necessary safeguards—an extraordinary remedy for an extraordinary evil. But it may be doubted if our ancestors intended,—and they were certainly wrong if they did intend,—to convert a temporary remedy into an abiding rule,—and to make an abnormal the normal order of things, the condition of England's being to the end of time. Men were then so engrossed with one enemy, that they failed to consider the bearing of their measures against him on any other or future persons; and enactments, framed with an exclusive view to one end, are now found to have a wider application than was ever intended. It cannot be right to presume and provide for the perpetuity of schism; to prevent Bishops who boast that they are Apostolic from ever being Catholic, by forbidding their attendance in any but an Anglican council; to sever the Church in England from the communion of all other Churches, for the sake of guarding her against the aggressions of one; and to invest the British nation with the attributes, and its legislature with the functions of the Church. Nor, if the right of heathen kings to reign be undoubted, can it be just, either to a Christian king or to the Catholic Church, to clog his title to the throne, (a thing in itself wholly independent of his faith) with the perpetual

condition that he shall belong to a particular section of the Church. As long as he accepts his crown under conditions, by those conditions he is bound. At a particular time such conditions may be needful, but permanent law they should not be ; and it does seem inconsistent that they who refused to the Scots a Covenant king, should provide by immovable statute for a Protestant one.

Rome generally bides her time ; on the present occasion she has not. The temptation to a premature step has been great. He were no true Romanist who could hold his hand from hitting the many blots recently made by the Anglican Church in doctrine and discipline ; and who would not leave the care of Westminster paupers to others, that he might scramble for spoil in the ecclesiastical ruin of our land, against which Dr. Wiseman, as a pastor, exultingly writes his "Mene," and, as a cardinal, points his sanctified irony. Rome has committed herself by preferring her claim, and little dreams that in doing so she evokes a better claimant.

Abstractly considered, the toleration of Romish worship implies that of Romish hierarchy. To us it seems both a suicidal and an illegal act for the Pope to wipe out from England's map the episcopates planted by his own predecessor, with consent of the civil power, in times of old, and to plant others in their place as on land yet unreclaimed. It lies with him to be at unison with his former self, and to explain his direct breach of faith with England's ancient government. He is no doubt free to fix time and mode in the development of his spiritual rule among us, in so far as he does not subvert our constitution. But his recent measure, although the position of the Church and empire assailed by it may be a false one, cannot be justified on that or any other ground. It is most clearly an aggression in spirit, against which the outcry is not groundless, and the instinctive repulsion not without an object. While the manifesto of the Cardinal is the measured language of one sobered by unexpected opposition, the pastoral address is the unguarded effusion of an intoxicated conqueror. *In vino veritas*. Be the Papal Bull what it may in the letter, the Cardinal evidently sees in it, and intends by his pastoral address, exactly what England has seen in both ; although he hoped that she would not see it, and believed that she would not resent it. In his pastoral address he speaks *at* the nation while speaking *to* his clergy and people. He therein welcomes, commands, and threatens us as a true

Romanist ought ; while in the manifesto he speaks as a real and straightforward Romanist ought not. The Pope is now professedly planting true bishops among pretenders. He asserts the true supremacy against an usurper. He stands forth among us in the open plenitude of power, fettered or masked by no concordat, as in continental and Romish lands. He draws the long broken-down fence of the fold round heretics and schismatics again. *Urbi et orbi* is his motto still.

But although the aggression is real, it is not undeserved, and ought not to have been unexpected. Most of the platform arguments now used against it might have been in right place and time as against Catholic emancipation,—against the supposed admission of an aggressive and heretical sect to the privileges of harmless and orthodox bodies ; but here they are utterly misplaced and anachronous. We are only reaping as we sowed. It is but a fresh link in that chain of consequences which we would not or could not trace beforehand. It is idle to start at the presence of a stranger for whom we opened the door, or at the application of principles which we ourselves have laboured to establish ; and it is unjust to have trifled with others by destructive experiments in distant and neglected suburbs, from which we selfishly revolt when completed in the citadel. The aggression made we have long practically invited. We may shrink from its contact, but we cannot deny that it is deserved.

The only arguments which are not too late are those which regard the supremacy of the Queen and the integrity of the Episcopate. The Church, although in the world, is not of it ; the State, though also ordained of God, is of the world, and has the rule over all that is of the world. In so far as it mistakes the Church for a worldly thing, it claims to govern her. In so far as she makes the same mistake, she either submits to, or else, when circumstances favour, usurps civil government. In either case she is alike degraded ; and the contests for mastery between Christian kings and prelates are the standing testimony that the Church no longer seeks the kingdom to come. On the other hand, the rise of the Papacy is the proof of a true consciousness in the Church that Bishops are not adequate even to maintain, far less to perfect, her without apostleship over them. All attempts by Bishops, single or in synod, to constitute or exercise Catholic rule, independent of a power visibly standing over them, had been, as they must be, signal failures, and only developed the evils they would cure or

prevent. The want felt was real; the supply in the person of a Pope was inadequate, yet beneficial. But when, at the Reformation, the Pope was, more from indignation at his misgovernment than from any apprehension of truth regarding the permanent rule of Apostles over all Christian Bishops, declared a usurper, men drew the unwarranted inference, that because his was not the true supremacy, the King's was. Having no faith to bring forth again from God the forfeited blessing of apostleship, and being nevertheless convinced that supremacy was needed, they could do no better than choose the best of things seen. They chose the King, because they knew not that third alternative, which God and Christ alone can furnish. In spite of all efforts made by those who smart under Royal supremacy to explain it away, nothing is clearer than that it happened to England as it did to the great mass of Protestant Europe, and that the supreme guidance of the Church in England was neither maintained in a Catholic form, nor abolished, nor devolved on the Bishops; but was transferred to the King, only modified in character, and limited in extent to the British dominions. The retention or abolition of Episcopacy does not alter the case.

When we see Episcopalians who assert, and Presbyterians who deny, that the Queen is the head of the Church, uniting to vindicate her supremacy against Papal aggression, it is time to ascertain exactly what we mean in talking of Papal and Royal supremacy. The Pope unites in his person two forms of supreme power. He is supreme temporal ruler over a limited territory,—the Roman States. Although his rule arises from his ecclesiastical position, it is in itself purely political; and though we may question its propriety, we cannot question its validity. He is indicated in a different way from other kings, but his right and standing are the same. But he is also supreme ecclesiastical head of a large section of the Church, and claims to be the head of the whole. This rule does not depend on his government of the Roman States; neither does it *professedly* interfere with the civil government of other States. But he claims to be the Vicar of Christ, by whose authority kings reign; to convey that authority to them; to exercise it through them; to demand their services in effecting ecclesiastical objects, and to divest them of it when unfaithful to him. On the ground that the head of the Church has power over all persons in the same, and therefore over all rulers, he claims, not indeed to rule in each State, but to control the rule in

each, to create, and to abolish it, as the glory of God and the interests of the Church may require. While he regards as sheep of his fold all who have wandered from it, though he may for a time postpone or ignore his claim, so does he regard as subject to his disposal all kings in Christendom; not only those who acknowledge, but those who deny his power, though he may for a time abstain from urging his right. All treaties by which his supremacy over Christian States is set aside, or his freedom of ecclesiastical action among them limited, are at direct variance with his place and duty. Policy may dictate them; but he stoops to conquer.

The oath taken by Romanist members of Parliament (we must suppose with consent of the Pope) is one which we cannot imagine him to sanction, save on the ground that he can loose from its obligation; and one which we cannot imagine them to take, unless on the ground that it is right to accept liberation from it—grounds which make it quite indifferent how the oath is framed, or whether there be an oath at all. For it is certainly the *unrepealed law of Rome* that the Pope can absolve subjects from their allegiance; that he, as a foreign Prelate, can *indirectly* have civil power in the realm; that the Church of Rome holds all Church property in Britain to be her's, and the Anglican Church Establishment one which ought to be subverted; and that each English Roman Catholic is bound to use every privilege to disturb and weaken the religion and government of Britain, in so far as they are Protestant. The tacit permission of an oath at variance with law is no repeal of the latter.

On the other hand, the Queen of England unites in her person also two forms of supreme power, although both are limited to her dominions. She rules as civil governor all persons and things of this world, and she claims also to rule all persons and things not of this world, in so far as she finds them in her dominions. Although she receives her crown and unction in the Church, she derives her right to the throne not from the Church, but from the law of the land. And while she claims to be an ecclesiastical person, and to exercise ecclesiastical rights, she derives both solely from her position as Queen. Their basis is political, not religious. Where she is not Queen she has no ecclesiastical power; and did she cease to be Queen, that power would cease.

We find, then, in the position of the Pope and of the Queen two false elements, even if we assume the Pope to be the lawful spiritual head of the Catholic Church. The Pope

claims right over kings as such, because, as a priest, he has right over them as men. He claims to be supreme in the Church, and therefore supreme over kings, and on both grounds to have power in England. The Queen claims right over priests as such, because she, as Queen, has right over them as men. She claims to be supreme in the State, and therefore supreme over the Church, and on both grounds to exclude the Pope. Both parties act thus because the Church has ceased to know or exhibit her true place. And, as the punishment of her sin, here is the debateable ground which must germinate all strife: a universal priesthood, aggressive against a local monarchy usurpant. Did each power retain its true place, there would be none. The powers of the Queen and the Pope, as temporal rulers, can no more conflict than those of any others. But the Queen governs the Church in her dominions. It matters not that she does so by Bishops, and rules in spirituals by spirituals; it is she who rules. Be the instruments or counsellors who they may, the fountain of power is the same. This her government renders impossible all government of the Anglican Church as part of the whole. It not only excludes that of the Pope, but would alike exclude any other Catholic rule, were its claims to be of the very best,—were it that of Apostles themselves. This is the Royal supremacy which Episcopalians admit, and Presbyterians deny, and which is assailed by the spiritual supremacy of the Pope. On the other hand, the Pope seeks entrance into the realm, to do more than govern the Church as a heavenly thing, to do more than Apostles would, to interfere with the government of the earthly thing, and to enlist an earthly power in his service. Therefore, he causes the door to be shut against him by assuming an attitude dangerous to the integrity of temporal rule, avails himself of unlawful means to carry out his ecclesiastical objects, and provokes the civil power to exclude those who have better right than he, and bring no such danger as he does.

We see, then, what is true and what is false in the cry about supremacy. The Papal rule, although preferable to the absence of all supremacy ecclesiastical, and although professing to be Catholic, is not the true ecclesiastical and Catholic supremacy. If the Christian people of England rejected the supremacy of the Pope because they knew and desired the true supremacy, that of Apostles, their rejection would be just, though, till Apostles assumed the supremacy, premature, and therefore dangerous. And if they rejected

the false supremacy because they actually had the true, this act would be both just and well-timed. But when they reject a supremacy which, though uncatholic and usurped, is yet ecclesiastical, because they prefer a supremacy which is neither catholic, legitimate, nor ecclesiastical, they make no true progress in reform, they occupy a position fraught with danger, and exclusive of hope. The Royal supremacy compasses the Church of England with a national hedge, which utterly precludes her communion (except in the way of mere sympathy) with other Churches. While it lasts she cannot be Catholic, for she lacks the joints and bands by which Christ holds His whole body together. She cannot go on to perfection, for that perfection is one common to the whole body. Her Bishops are subject to authority which the Catholic Church cannot own. And instead of mending the matter, it makes it worse, that the same may, though in other words, be said of other clergy in Christendom. It is no disloyalty to our most gracious Sovereign, our sole ruler in the things of this world, to say, that the Royal supremacy, into the arms of which the Anglican Church throws herself to avoid the Papal, is an idol which will smite those who servilely burn incense to it, and scare those who selfishly bask in its favour. It is an ominous cry, "We have no king but Cæsar." The Royal supremacy, professedly the stay of the Church, lies really as an incubus upon her life, and is now looked to with hope by her foes as the means of diluting her doctrine, degrading her authority, and converting her into a mere school or police for the State. What though the Bishops have generally been left to liberty of action, and may be personally right-hearted men? They are still creatures and servants of a secular power. Policy may soon turn the other way, and bind them according to law with fetters which nothing but martyrdom can break. Our Queen is our governor as men; but Apostles are the sole supreme rulers in the Church. By none but Apostles, for whom our Lord prayed that they might be one as He and the Father, can the Church be made one. By none, save the fourfold ministry which He appointed to perfect His Bride, can she be perfected and prepared for His return.

The supposed conflict between the Queen and the Pope in regard to the worldly rank of his prelates, is either a pure fallacy, or a reality which too clearly indicates the false position of each. Rank and honour bestowed by the Pope as a temporal prince would meet with the same recognition in Britain as those bestowed by any other. And had

dignitaries of the Christian Church no secular rank, no one would dream of its being in England either claimed by or assigned to those of other Churches. Rank in the Church and rank in the State are not things homogeneous. They belong to categories totally distinct. They cannot be compared. One cannot be higher or lower than the other. But that confusion of things, heavenly and earthly, throughout Christendom, by which bishops are, on the ground of their Episcopate, holders of rank in the world, is that which permits an else impossible contest for precedence, and opens the door to aggression on the part of priests; for though peers may be bishops, bishops cannot be peers without losing their lawful power, or acquiring an unlawful one. We do not deny that the Romish Episcopate is true. There are not two kinds of Episcopate. And if one Englishman as bishop ranks as a peer, why should not another, because he has got the same Episcopate otherwise? The Pope, by the mere act, commits neither fraud nor aggression in ordaining Englishmen as bishops. He does not smuggle them into secular rank under cover of an ecclesiastical act. He ordains them *bonâ fide*. He, as the head of the Church, never ought to dream of conferring thereby secular rank. By the almost universal error of Christendom, he does indeed thereby place them in a position where they can claim it. But the fact that they acquire right to an earthly honour by obtaining a heavenly office, is due, not to Papal machination, but to the erroneous principles of European law. It will not do to argue that the Queen is in Britain the sole fountain of honour, and that the rank of Romish prelates implies a rival fountain. From the Pope, as Pope, no secular honours flow. He can be no rival of the Queen in this. If the secular rank of his dignitaries in Britain is unwelcome to us, let us blame ourselves for having given bishops rank at all. Let us separate the heavenly from the earthly by ceasing to attach secular office and precedence to the dignitaries of the Church, and our contest with Rome on this head will cease.

We now come to the integrity of the Episcopate. Where all the inhabitants of a given territory are Christian, the geographical and spiritual provinces coincide. And, as convenience dictates the division of the faithful into many flocks, so does it dictate the division of their territory into many dioceses. But a bishop is an overseer. That which he oversees is not a territory, but a flock. The inhabitants of a certain district may be assigned to him, but the district

is not. Even where a bishop is a peer, he has no temporal right of property therein; far less in his true spiritual place—for every geographical right must, in this present dispensation, be merely temporal. The State may portion out territory, but the Church alone can portion out souls. And it is an invasion of her true spiritual province when the State, while allowing her exclusive right to constitute spiritual ministries, claims right to determine the sphere within which these ministries shall be exercised. The same spiritual grace which discerns the abstract fitness for office in the House of God, is needed to discern the adaptation of the labourer to those among whom he shall labour. The power to ordain and the power to employ are both alike ecclesiastical. The ancient provision of the Canon law which prohibited one bishop from intruding into the diocese of another, was intended to defend the integrity, not of a territorial right, but of a pastoral office. The evil to be dreaded in the Church was not a contest for territorial jurisdiction, secular functions, and worldly honour, but a contest for the right of Episcopal oversight among prelates, whose over-zeal or ambition incited them to interferences from which the fear of increased responsibility and the due honouring of each other should have deterred them. With the latter contest, alas! we have been too long familiar. Having divided that body of Christ, we have thought to multiply it, and to make of each fragment a body. Under the guise of rival shepherds, sheep-stealers have ruled the land approved—at least uncondemned. What is permitted to every sectary we are surely too liberal to refuse the Pope, unless we confess that he is *more* than the head of a sect,—that the place which he claims is right. And had territory and rank not been touched by the form of his oversight, he might have been left in peace either to tear Christ's flock yet more, or to gather to the fold, as different men might designate his act, in spite of musty canons, dragged from undeserved repose, at a time when the spirit which dictated and the generation who understood them are both departed. The Anglo-Roman hierarchy has three distinct elements—the ordination of bishops, the bestowal of titles, and the territorial partition,—each of which affects the Anglican Episcopate in a different way. The first is unobjectionable as an act of mere internal government, were it confined to the adherents of Rome; but it is the act of one who claims to be the shepherd of all Christians in England, and therefore his bishops must claim an oversight in England which

excludes that of the Anglican bishops. Rome is false to herself if the two can stand side by side. The Romish Episcopate attacks the Anglican in its true spiritual place.

The second element and the third are akin to each other. They do not touch the English Episcopate in its spiritual place, but they affect the location and jurisdiction which it has received by law, disturbing, confounding, or expunging both. And herein does the Pope—it matters not whether as prince, or priest, or private person—not only revoke and alter the acts of his predecessors, but do what he can to nullify the law of England, and thus place himself in direct antagonism to Queen, Lords, and Commons. He cannot by mere avoiding of names escape the charge of blotting out one Episcopate by another. He is inconsistent with himself if he admits the creation and subsistence of the former, and inconsistent with British law if he denies them.

The late Papal Bull has roused to one common protest multitudes so diverse in character and motives as to be seldom united on any occasion. It has roused the faithful and the faithless alike.

On the one hand we have—

1. The godly Churchman, who rejects the universal pastorship of the Pope, and an intrusive Episcopate.

2. The orthodox divine, who puts under ban a heretical Church till it shall renounce its heresies.

3. The pious Evangelical, be he sectary in heart or sectary in name only, who unchurches Rome for her cruelties, heresies, idolatries, and other abominations; who lifts his protest against those that propagate delusion and trample down liberty of conscience with the show of authority from God; and who stamps everything as Popery which reins religious licence, and visibly exercises the authority, or symbolizes the truth, of God.

4. The honest moral man, who will strike no bargain with licensed liars, will hold no parley with the enemies of sound reason, and will show every man the door who subverts or corrupts his household.

On the other hand we have—

1. The worldly statesman, who blocks up every avenue against the introduction of an *imperium in imperio*, and who will have no priests recognized by the State who are not its creatures and slaves.

2. The worldly Churchman, who, grown fat on the fruits of the Church, and secure under the shadow of the State,

sees danger to the flock of Christ in everything that may affect his sole right to their fleece, or may compete with him for local dominion, social rank, secular emolument, or State favour.

3. The man of unintelligent English prejudice, roused by a hue and cry against something which must be worthless because it is not English, ridiculous because he cannot comprehend it, and dangerous because it meddles with his liberty and disturbs his habits.

4. The infidel hater and subverter of Christ, who, reading still, in that which pietists call blasphemy and idolatry, the letters of that holy Name which he has vowed utterly to expunge, rails with the faithful at Rome,—they for her sins against Christ, he for her confession of His Name.

Such is the motley assemblage which, with one consent, lifts its many-toned voice against "Papal aggression;" and if we would rightly estimate the nature of the movement, we must look not only at the thing protested against, but at the condition of those who protest.

There never was such a waste of trouble and talk as in the so-called exposures of Romish errors. They are as the barking of dogs at Behemoth. They have no point, for they assail the unofficial; they have no power, for they are unofficial themselves. They do not touch the true question, and they cannot do so; for those who make them are not in the true position,—the only position which can bring out the true question in a practical form. The Papacy is no random congeries of errors so plain that a child may see them, and that none but a fool or a knave can maintain them. It is no patent unadulterated blasphemy or folly. It is the chief of the ways of God; ways of God pervade it all. In it those ways are more developed than in any other Church, but therefore more perverted. It is a masterpiece of God, of man, and of the devil. It is a mystery, which men cannot fathom or gauge. It contains depths which not only once were, but still are, depths of God, yet transformed by man's wickedness into depths of Satan,—depths, compared to which all Protestant systems, pure though they may boast themselves, are absolute shallows. It is an edifice which will stand its appointed time until God's time for a better comes, and which they unjustly malign who think to honour the foundation the more the less they build upon it. The Papal sect is not more wicked than any other part of the Church; each has sinned as it could in its own way. And the sin of Rome stands pre-eminent, only because

the truth corrupted by her is deeper and broader than elsewhere. The Romish system contains no mere empty falsehood. It is the prostitution of truth; its very lies are full of meaning. We are, therefore, not justified, and can do no good, in denouncing it, unless we know—nay, unless we can show—the truth therein abused and profaned. To stand on a lower platform and rail at it, is a childish, ignorant, and fruitless, though, to our self-conceit, perhaps, a flattering work. We honour it too little to be able to expose it. None can effectually do so but he who knows how high it stands as a work of God, and who at the same time stands himself on a higher platform still. We must possess the hidden things of Esau ourselves as things of God—ay, and much more than them—if we would search them out in Him as things of Satan. We must be ourselves not mere Gospel Christians, but the perfect in Christ, if we would prevail against him whom the sword of God alone can smite, and take that defenced city of Edom into which God alone can lead us. Even the giants of the Reformation and of the Anglican Episcopate neither stood in the position, nor had the armour required; how much less this trivial, and shallow, and heady generation, emasculate and unloyal,—among whom uncertainty reigns, whom isolation weakens and idle clamour leads, and whose every loquacious sciolist takes licence to speak evil of all that he cannot understand! Can they show the false place of the Church who do not know the true one? Can they expose priestcraft who deny priesthood? Can they banish superstition and idolatry who eschew all mystery, empty all sacraments, count all visible worship carnal, and tread God's courts without fear? Can they cast off tyranny who reject rule? Can they expose a false unity who have not the true? Can they detect false doctrine who are blanks as to the true? Can they demonstrate the cheats with which the spiritual wants of men are put off, whose holiness consists in having no such wants? Can they reject false gifts and miracles whose faith is that gifts and miracles have ceased? Can they detect the prostitution of Christ's presence who believe not in His presence at all? Can they expose the error of the Mass who offer not the sacrifice of the Eucharist? Can they assail the Papal supremacy who seek not, and who have not, Apostles of the Lamb?

Yet such is the present state of those who rail most at Rome. Such is the state of too many in the Anglican Church, and in every part of the Church Catholic; losing,

step by step, the characters of the people of God, and blindly expecting salvation from idols which men's hands have made; some puffed up for the molten, some for the graven image; every man running to his own house, while the Lord's House lies waste,—its stones and furniture here scattered on the ground, there ranged incongruous in religious museums of antiquity. The Anglican Church has consented to schism as a thing lawful, as a condition in which it is possible to meet her returning Lord. She has disowned the sacrifice of the Eucharist; she has declared that she regards with equal eye those who believe baptism to be regeneration and those who do not. Her bishops leave her clergy to their own shifts, or enforce each his own private opinion, or at best have no other counsel than to avert the eye from questions which cannot be solved, and to abstain from all positive faith and action in matters of deep and constant practical importance. False burdens and causes of banishment are proclaimed. The true remain unseen or blinked; and that security which is the prelude of ruin, prevails. Discipline is either not attempted, or, where attempted, discouraged by law, and eschewed as Popery by the pious. All allegiance and confidence are shaken; unbelief in priesthood, and other such essentials of the Church, as a divine polity, is publicly proclaimed without rebuke to applauding multitudes; and the whole current of men's words at present clearly shows that while a conflict with Rome is the thing on the surface, the disruption of the Anglican Church is the thing at men's hearts, as that which they seek or dread. The public ear is so sore, and the fear of man so great, that men who know better hide themselves. Dignitaries of the Church who in their hearts reject secular supremacy in things spiritual, are silent when the occasion demands their testimony. And as to those clergy who have glimmerings of the true problem to be solved, whom the Anglican Church, instead of seeing those shortcomings in herself which their spirits are stirred to remove, has cruelly made the scapegoats for her own offences, and would now treat like the Jonah of the ship,—they have made earnest, indeed, but mistaken and fruitless, efforts to solve it. They long for the communion of the Catholic Church, and enlargement to the full measure of Catholic doctrine and rites. But they cannot stir without passing the bounds of obedience, and being guides to themselves; and having no light forwards, they turn to the indiscriminate worship of the past, blinding themselves to danger by nursing their pride of spiritual

ancestry,—standing as a solecism, but not as a sign, to a faithless, fearless, and prosaic generation. Not able to lay hold on the invisible, they turn to the best thing visible; as our fathers to the king, so they to the Pope. Although some of them may fancy the Greek Church, yet, if they are consistent, they must ultimately fall to Rome, unless they have faith to receive Apostles from the risen Lord. And if they do go to Rome, they must go to Rome as she is, and cannot, by joining, reform her. For none can have communion with Rome without adopting her errors, who does not himself occupy a higher vantage-ground than Rome does. They are on the way to bondage because they are impelled by fear; they are retreating from judgment, but thus they cannot escape it. The things that cannot be shaken are before us, not behind us; and those only shall be delivered who wait for the Lord from Heaven. He who abides in his place will meet the judgment where he ought, and if faithful, will come through it; but he who deserts his place, would fashion his own lot, and hide himself from God—he has still judgment in prospect; and having shrunk from God's judgment of the Church to which he belonged, will share the future and sorer one of the Church into which he flees. He will fail both to attain what he seeks, and to escape what he dreads. Let him play necromancy with the Fathers, petition for panacea or rather Pandora convocations, or dream of future Œcumenical Councils, as he may; all he would do has already been done, and failed. No changes rung upon existing things, no fancy *rechauffée*, no new shuffle of the cards, will help a jot. No man or company of men can bring cosmos out of chaos; none but He who has promised to make all things new, and sends His messengers to prepare His way, by restoring all things. Nor is it enough to abide where we are, in the mere obstinate fidelity of despair, or in the contentment of blindness. We must abide the shipwreck, yet do so as the children of hope. The emphatic words of Pusey, that he should prove his fidelity to the Anglican Church by DYING *in her communion*, speak volumes by that which they omit. He determines that the Lord shall not come till he die. With the Tractarian party as a body, the Second Coming of the Lord is no living hope. They cannot be the true restorers of the Church who direct neither their own labours nor her desires to preparation for the Lord from Heaven. That is a hard conflict which has no release but death.

The Anglican Church has, by her separate subsistence

for three centuries, given the best practical testimony against Rome which circumstances allowed. But she is now seen divided, as the Jews of old, into the Pharisee, the Sadducee, and the Herodian; and of her it may well be said, as of the whole Church, "There is none to guide her among all the sons that she has brought forth." Whether the destiny of England be different from that of the rest of Christendom, it would be rash to say. It may be that in the events of the Commonwealth, she preceded other nations in tasting the cup which they drank more recently. She may now be the first to be tried in the balances of God, that she may be fitted to help others in the like trial. Tyre may yet be signally visited in mercy, and used for blessing, after her glory has been brought down. But of this we may be sure, that the only hope for the Church of England is, that she be governed with the Church Universal in the right way by Apostles again. They are the true sons of the Church, who can save their mother; the true fathers of the children of God; the ministers of His Spirit; the guides of His ministers; the stewards of His house; the presidents in the councils of the Church; the true espousers and preparers of the Bride; the Catholic receivers of Christ's Catholic promises. He has but one way of rule and blessing from the beginning,—but one way to perfection for His people now. And no less certain is it that the only safety of the State lies in recognizing a spiritual supremacy in the Church, which is neither British nor foreign, but divine. The rule of Christ by Apostles in the Church is the mystery of His future kingdom, and therefore it is the only rule which can never conflict with the government of the kingdoms that are. The calling of Apostles is to sustain every man in his true place, and teach him his duty; not to disturb his place, or do his duty for him.

Yet are the winds holden, that the remnant may return to God, and be sealed of Him with the Holy Ghost against the blast of the terrible, and unto the coming of the Son of Man. Who shall work when the night cometh? Who shall stand in the great day of wrath? All Christendom down to the Reformation, and the mass of Christendom to this day, has testified with one consent that supremacy in the Church can neither lay hid in Heaven, nor stand in mere diocesan bishops; that it must have its visible expression and centre, as binding together, sustaining, and controlling the Christian Episcopate. While the supremacy of the Pope and that of the Queen stand opposed to each other, each with an un-

grounded claim, let us not side with either ; neither let us be content with none. But let us embrace the THIRD ALTERNATIVE, and seek from God the true supremacy, ecclesiastical, catholic, and legitimate. Now is the day of salvation.

A book, though inspired of God, can neither rule the Church, nor minister to her the Holy Ghost. Neither can the Church rule or anoint herself. Christ is her sole ruler, and He alone ministers the Spirit to her. This rule, this ministry, He does not leave to chance ; He has His own way in both. That way He has made known, and from that way He will not depart. Not by democracy—not by headless councils—not by temporal intruders—not by a spiritual usurper—only by Apostles will He now, as at the beginning, exercise his Catholic rule, and bestow His saving unction, and prepare the way of His return. The commission to His Twelve stands unrevoked. The cry of faith He will answer, by raising up those who shall resume and fulfil it. Let us not limit the Holy One of Israel. Let us beware lest, through idolatry of Apostolic succession, we reject Apostles themselves.

THE DOOR OF HOPE FOR BRITAIN.

“Our help standeth in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.”

1853.

THE DOOR OF HOPE FOR BRITAIN.

“They shall speak with the enemies in the gate.”—Ps. cxxvii. 5.

A COSMOPOLITE cannot be a patriot; but each man should be a patriot. Christianity sanctifies all natural distinctions, be they personal, domestic, or national; yet it obliterates none. It prevents them from being the subjects of boasting or the occasions of strife; yet it maintains their integrity. The ancients fought *pro aris et focis*. Christian nations have, or should have, but one altar; in the one House of God there should be no partition walls. Yet all nations, like all families, should have their *foci*; for even in the future dispensation shall be seen the “*nations* of the saved.” King and country may be the idols of the narrow-minded, but to have neither is only the attainment of the infidel. That fraternity which abates all national quarrels is of Christ; but that which merges all national distinctions is of Antichrist. Under the garb of philanthropy, it at once effaces the landmarks and bursts the bands of Christ. It is, therefore, no mark of littleness when Britons stand by Britain. It is our duty so to do. And we are not sinning against the rest of Christendom in preserving her integrity, provided the integrity of other nations be not sacrificed to hers.

God has no favourites among the nations. His ancient people were not His favourites. He did not choose them for their excellence; they grieved Him more than any. Nations do not rise or fall by chance. Their own efforts do not elevate, and those of others do not abase, them. They are God’s creatures and instruments. His dealings with them regard His purpose in Christ. Their place depends on the mission which He assigns to them, and their welfare on the faithfulness with which they fulfil it. Their polity is civil, but the argument of their being is ecclesiastical; for the Church is the mystery of Christ’s kingdom on earth, and for that kingdom they prepare.

God has made Britain great. Not her constitution, nor her fleets and armies, nor her enterprise, nor her resources. These are the mere scaffolding; they are neither the building nor the builder. The condition of her greatness is that she fulfils the mission for which He made her great. Otherwise she must fall—tried, and found wanting. Wherein she has failed, the first conditions of her recovery are knowledge of her errors; the honest, humble, and open confession of them; and the reform of her ways. Till these conditions are complied with, all expedients are in vain.

What has been her mission? And how has she fulfilled it?

Britain has a twofold mission. She has one in common with other Christian nations, and she has one peculiar to herself. By both must her conduct be judged and her fate determined; and both concern her relation to the Church.

The history of one chosen people is the divine lesson for another. The Jews were chosen of God to be the depositaries of His truth, the examples of His ways, the ministers of His blessing, and the expectants of His kingdom. They were educated for a certain end—namely, to receive Messiah. They defeated the education, and so they missed the mark. They not only shed the blood of God, but they shed it by law. Their perverseness had gradually brought them into a false position, in which they could not, in conscience and consistency, do otherwise. God has turned to the Gentiles, not now to convert them all, but to take out of them a people for His name, in the place of that which He had lost. The Christian Church is indeed propagated by spiritual instead of natural generation. Its standing as the body of Christ immeasurably transcends that of the most faithful or favoured among the unbaptized. The end set before it is vastly more glorious; yet the conditions of its salvation are similar to those under which Israel stood—namely, that it shall profit by the education of God, and be in all respects prepared to receive the Lord Jesus Christ when He shall return, not in earthly but in heavenly glory, to reign on earth. All who defeat this education shall also miss the mark. They shall crucify the Son of God afresh. They shall do it by law. They shall, through their sin, come into a position in which to do so shall seem the clear path of duty. That which will not be the temple of God, shall become a habitation of devils. They who will not be ruled by Christ shall become the slaves of Antichrist. From this issue no amount of religious knowledge, of human wisdom or watchfulness, volition or exertion,

can save them. God is the only Saviour, and He saves the obedient. To the disobedient, knowledge is the armoury, wisdom the counsel, and exertion the energy, of treason. By disobedience did man forfeit the first paradise—by it he shall fail of the second. Not the ignorance, but the disobedience of Christendom now hurries it to ruin. They who love pleasures more than God—not the votaries of sensual enjoyment, but they whose acts, pious or impious (the worse if the former), are what they please to do, not what God would have them to do—they, being lawless, shall be gathered under the lawless one. They shall be judged according to their sin. For that true liberty which springs out of obedience, they shall have that bondage for which false liberty prepares. Our Christian standing, although a moral argument, is no physical charm against apostasy. The perverse shall have strong delusion from God Himself to believe a lie. That lie shall be, in all its varied forms, the very thing which human aspirations shall hail, and human wisdom approve; and it shall be sealed by miracles which no scepticism can resist. “The day of Christ shall not come, except there come THE falling away first.” The man of sin shall be revealed before the Man of righteousness—the son of perdition before the Son who abideth for ever—the usurper before the Heir—he that cometh in his own name before He that cometh in that of the Father—man, seeming to be God, before God really man. It has ever been the way of God to make the apostasy of the faithless the prelude of advancement to the faithful. The Christian apostasy, that which now ripens apace among us, agrees with the Jewish in this, that it shall be perfected ere men dream of their danger. But in this it differs, that while recovery from the Jewish is possible, recovery from the Christian is impossible; because the latter is a fall from the highest elevation of which man is capable. Truly, it is a thing to be wept over, not to be discussed in cold blood; to be feared by the trustful, not to be played with by the secure. *Antichristology*, in every form and sphere, is now becoming the small talk of European society. It is the wretched substitute for *Christology* with those who know that they should be religious, yet like not to be godly—whose senses are no longer exercised to discern between good and evil—whose hearts will not follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. But the sole defence against the lie is progress in the truth; and the sole argument against it, that no lie is of the truth. Men may play with Antichrist as with a bird, and bind him for their maidens, and make a covenant with him,

yea, take him for their servant as they please. Satan will laugh while he lets them play; he will furnish them with more playthings; he will let them bind him, and thus more surely take them in his snare. The study of evil shall never save us from it. We shall thus only the sooner learn to accept it. But, looking at Christ, and abiding in Him, by this token shall we conquer—"Greater is He that is in us than he that is in the world."

Now, if such be the turning-point in the destiny of the Church, we should expect to find the same in that of Christian nations. To talk of separating religion from politics, argues the profoundest ignorance of what religion and politics are. Blended they should not be. The State has no right to dictate the doctrine and discipline, or to perform the functions, of the Church; and, despite the sophism of Thomas Aquinas, that because Moses called the Jews a "priestly kingdom," and Peter called Christians "royal priests," therefore, as kings had temporal rule under the law, so have priests under the Gospel, it is equally clear that the priest has no more right to political than to domestic functions. But the Church should furnish all her children with right principles of action for every sphere of life, and, therefore, for the exercise of civil government as the most important sphere of all. No actions of Christian men, and especially no actions of Christian rulers, can be indifferent before God, either in character or in consequences. They should be accordant with His will, as learned in the Church. In so far as they are, the nations please Him; in so far as they are not, the reverse. Therefore, if the destiny of the Church depends on obedience to Him, that of Christian nations no less does so; and if the Church is, through lawlessness, in danger of falling under the lawless one, the nations are so too. In this only do the cases differ, that while the judgment on the Church shall be ecclesiastical, that on the nations shall be national.

Hence, what we have now to fear is that the nations of Christendom, being found unfaithful to God in their civil polity, whether by despising His precepts, by favouring evil, or by hindering good, shall be carried away by a vast political delusion, the counterpart of the ecclesiastical, and thus fall under the political domination of Antichrist. We have no warrant to look for the exemption of any nation from this fate, save as the reward of fidelity to Christ. And as in Church, so in State, apostasy shall be the rule, fidelity the rare exception.

Of this sad consummation we have in the prophetic portions of Holy Scripture many intimations, diversified in form, but alike in substance. And the events of the first French Revolution, coupled with the career of the first Napoleon, were a dim foreshowing of it, to which few thoughtful men, political or religious, have been blind. That crisis has passed away; but the greater crisis which it foreshowed is yet before us. Britain was not only exempted from the former in a way too manifest to be regarded as accidental, but prominently used by God in bringing it to an end. And it is for us a practical question of the most vital importance, whether we may hope to see her in like manner both exempted from the latter, and used in bringing it also to an end?

The sins of Britain have not been small, and the amount of her privileges and blessings has greatly aggravated them. Although she has, alas! added many (perhaps the worst) to the catalogue of her sins since Napoleon's fall, they were already manifest enough before his rise to justify her then sharing the fate of the rest of Europe. And we can ascribe her exemption only to one or both of two causes—viz., that, in spite of her many provocations, she did peculiarly give national witnesses for God against the delusions and wickedness of the time; and that God, who useth whom He will, had other and ulterior work in store for her, which required that she should be then exempted. We shall see the truth of both reasons.

At the time of the first French Revolution Britain was unquestionably the land where Apostolic institutions, elsewhere either retained to be abused or purged almost into evanescence, were found to the greatest extent at once comparatively intact and comparatively pure—where the pulse of manly freedom beat most highly in the veins of men who bowed to the majesty of law—where the *liberty* of the *subject* was a formula realized in both its factors—where religion had the largest place and the firmest root in the family, the school, the market, the tribunal, the senate, and the court; in fine, where the habits and institutions of the people still pre-eminently gave that honour to God which He could requite with honour.

It seemed as if, in that dark passage of our history, the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, Britain had anticipated the fate of other lands, in order to be afterwards justly exempted from it, and be a ready instrument for a peculiar work. With all the fanaticism or hypocrisy of the Round-

heads, their principles are as little to be compared with the blasphemies of revolutionary France as the North American with the French Republic. Our constitutional liberty and earnest piety have both outlived their sad metamorphosis in the 17th century. The chaos of the French Revolution, and the fixation which succeeded it, were not permitted to affect us. Our bulwarks were loyalty and religion. Those who in Britain called the evil good were but like heretics who make the faithful manifest. While the rest of Europe was beguiled, bewildered, or intimidated, the mass of this nation neither wavered in judgment nor faltered in action. From the first we took our stand to contradict, and our measures to abate, the lie. We would not believe them who said they were in sport, while they "cast firebrands, arrows, and death;" we held no parley with the criminals; we threw down the gauntlet for truth on the battle-field of national rights; we fought neither from malice nor for conquest; we vindicated the well-being of society; and when God would break the rod with which He had chastised the sins of His heritage, He broke it by those who, while they justified His wrath, saw and testified that the rod itself was the power of Satan. For almost the first time in the history of the world, a war was waged, holy in its origin, just in its conduct, and sanctifying in its effects; a war of *liberation* from more than a human oppressor. The spontaneous eucharists of the victors in Leipzig's great battle of nations were no *Te Deum* pomp of State hypocrisy and triumphant wrong. And whether Blucher saved or seconded our great departed captain, the day of Waterloo saw Britain and Prussia elevated in common, under the eye of God, to the peerless honour of throwing back the onset, and scattering the power of that day's Antichrist, when loosed, like Satan, for a season;—an omen this, perhaps, of fellowship in yet higher things to come. So did God at that time pardon those whom He spared, and employ those who would serve Him.

But how stands it now? The nations have forgotten their vows of penitent thankfulness. They have returned to their folly; they are leprous again. The pent-up lava of the volcano has wrought wider destruction in the earthquake. God has once more shaken the nations into chaos, and made drastic medicine their bread. We have seen the beginnings of what an ancient foresaw, *αἱ δημοκρατίαι αἱ μελλούσαι γιγνεσθαι*. And we have been once more exempt! Whence is this? What does it indicate? What does it warrant?

In God's patience, the end is not yet. He has stayed the

wrath; but have men changed their ways? Alas! far less than before. In the counsels and decrees of the Allied Powers after the fall of Napoleon we find a public faith in God—a purpose, however inadequately fulfilled, to serve Him—a regard at last to the good of the subject—an amendment of national life, which we now look for, comparatively, in vain. The so-called friends of order—they who would conserve—are now as godless as they who would change and destroy. Reaction, grovelling and selfish, cowardly and faithless, impenitent and infatuated, too dishonest to confess the sin and untruth of its base concessions, and bold only when secure, has no higher thought than to restore the *status quo*, by fair means or by foul. According to the words of Burke, “Kings have become tyrants from policy, because their subjects are rebels on principle;” and the little finger of the son is made thicker than the father’s loins. Nought is to be seen but potsherd with potsherd in ignoble strife. Flesh overreaches, coerces, exterminates flesh. Bullets and eaves-droppers keep the peace of incarcerated manhood. Every new measure turns a fresh ward of the lock and gives a fresh twist to the rope. But all in vain. Satan is thus to be neither banished nor bound. The cup of retribution is only filled to the brim. When the winds and waves of revolution arose, every house shook, for lack of God’s cement. The stout-hearted were as women—their faces gathering blackness—their hearts failing—their hands on their loins, as in travail. When the beast arose, the mighty were afraid. They were cast down at the sight of him; they hastened to stroke him the right way of the hair, and give him what he would. Archbishops blessed trees of liberty. Preachers canonized its martyrs. The dogs that could not bark learned to whine out flattery. The false prophets sanctified the delusion and sin of the rulers. But these made no peace with God. Now that they have found breathing time again, they say, “We were once surprised; we shall not be so again.” But what if God watch for the evil? They say, “Our hosts shall save us.” But who shall keep the hosts? “Great hosts save not a king.” What if Satan leaven, or the blast of God scatter the hosts? They say, “Our mountain stands strong.” But what if God touch the mountain?

Meanwhile, not by the will of God, but by the stealth of Satan, a new form of order does arise—the worse for being religious in its accidents, Satanic in its essence. By a

magic paradox, only the more strange that it surprises none whom it transmutes, the blossoms of revolution bear the fruit of empire. Το ἡθος το αὐτο, καὶ ἀμφω δεσποτικά των βελτιονων. "The grace of God and the will of the people" have brought forth, from the kettle of the sorcerer, one who neither seeks the one nor obeys the other, but will use that popular will, which he dictates, as a divine dispensation for crime. And selfish reactionists stupidly hail him as a god-send, tender to him unasked the hand of brotherhood, nay, give him *carte blanche* to do what he lists, merely because he can rule—whether by God or by Satan matters not to them. Thus, as of old in Herod and Pilate, do the most diverse forms of flesh betray their common basis. Alas! how wide of even the heathen's description: ὁ μὲν βασιλεὺς νομιμος, ὁ δὲ ἀρχὼν ἀκολουθός, ὁ δὲ ἀρχόμενος ἐλευθερός, αἱ δὲ ὅλα κοινωνία εὐδαιμων. The dragon and the beast have two forms indeed, but one evil heart; and the words of the false prophet to that one heart are carried out alike in the diverse works of both.

But how does Britain stand? Shall we too be deceived? or, being not deceived, shall we be overwhelmed?

If we are not deceived, we cannot be overwhelmed. The way of God is certain salvation. The judgment and the sin judged are ever correlatives. Salvation and destruction come only on those who are beforehand prepared for them. If we do not believe a lie, we need not fear it.

But shall we escape the great coming delusion? We know it to be a canon of the Divine procedure that God not only has at all times a refuge for His truth, but exhibits salvation parallel with destruction, on the same theatre and in the same measure. And although we cannot conclude with certainty, we may justly infer that those whom He has exempted from the beginnings and the progress of judgment are those also whom He especially desires to exempt from its further stages and consummation. Judgment, in this dispensation, is not confined to mere corporeal or temporal suffering; for the worst judgment of all is the blindness and impenitence of the prosperous. And there is good ground to believe that we shall now see the wicked prosper as they have never done before. Nay, this fact may form a large element in the machinery by which men will be deluded. Yet the temporal calamity of nations may be both a token and an accessory of spiritual. And if there is anything in the corporate instinctive presentiments of a nation, if "coming events cast their shadows before,"

there is not a little in the present tone of public feeling in Britain to fill the thoughtful with concern. As high looks go before a fall, so is the loud cry of peace and safety too often the prelude of judgment and the companion of latent alarm. Our affairs, in their mere human aspect, have seldom been more prosperous. Peace and enterprise abroad—flourishing trade and manufactures at home—poverty diminished—the troubles of disturbed interests quieted—the coffers of the State more than filled—yet withal, an undefined uneasiness, which will not be comforted away—the sign that in the Divine aspect of our affairs there is a controversy unsettled between us and God. The tempestive death of an octogenarian we regard, in spite of ourselves, as a signature of the time. We say that his mantle must have fallen on others; yet we doubt it much. As, at the time when a prophet of our day rang the knell of Babylon, our levity turned the burden of the Lord against us into the keynote of a musical festival, so did God thus order it, that at the obsequies of our aged hero we appropriated to ourselves, for music's sake, those ominous words of Isaiah which describe a people deserted by God, and which warn us to cease from man when the Lord arises to shake terribly the earth. Do not our public words of stoutness betray, while they cloak, the misgivings of our hearts? What means it, that in one breath we are assured of halcyon peace and incited to busy armament? Whence this reefing the canvas for a storm, with not a cloud in the sky? Whence this fear of invasion, without a quarrel or a threat? Whence this craven invitation of evil—this fascinated consent to the power of a spell—this tacit anticipation of a day—

“When Seine shall swallow Tiber; and the Thames,
By letting in them both, pollute her streams”?

—HERBERT.

Whence is this? The true answer is short—*Britain's conscience is not clean.*

It is written—“When these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh.” How do we interpret the phenomena of the time? Have we the key to the riddle of the future? Have we a beacon which lights across the chasm? Do we know and hail the issue? Or do we grope in the dark, and shrink as from a precipice? Are we surprised or prepared? Are we passing into darkness, or emerging into light? Do

we fast or feast because of what is coming? Do the things which fill others with fear fill us with hope? Or do we still fear their fear? Here lies the touchstone of our condition. If the Lord is not our fear, He cannot be our sanctuary. If He has a controversy with us, He cannot be our fear; for His is the fear of sons, not of slaves or enemies. There is no profit in croaking; there is no kindness in disheartening; there is no patriotism in despondency; but to remove all mistake as to the nature of the question at issue is the best of all services. We have to do with God. If He be for us, who shall be against us? But if He be against us, who shall stand against Him? Let Britons be of what stuff they may;—what shall avail the prestige of our name—what the heart of our masses—the bottom of our troops—the range of our rifles—the list of our first-rates—the screws of our steamers? These are all things which we do well to look to—things which God can use on our behalf. But what if He will not use them? Are they our gods, that we should trust them still? Can we stem the tide of His disfavour? Have we not rather to fear, for our long-spared island, calamity the most improbable, perhaps the most sudden? There is a godless dread which faith cannot share in, but there is a godly dread which faith should experience. There is a godless confidence which faith cannot feel, but there is a godly confidence which faith should inspire. The godly dread warns us to repent, the godly confidence is the proof that we have done so. Have we this proof or no?

So much for our history and prospects in the position common to us with other Christian nations. But we should understand neither our sin nor our duty, neither our danger nor our hope, if we did not advert to that which is peculiar in the place and mission of our country. This peculiarity rests partly on scriptural intimations, partly on facts.

The parallel drawn by many expositors between ancient Tyre and Great Britain is not without some foundation in truth, or destitute of instruction for us. It consists of five parts—referring to the position, to the sin, to the judgment, to the service, and to the blessing of that famous city.

Tyre—a stronghold in the days of Joshua and those of David—honoured to aid in the building of the temple under Solomon, and in its rebuilding under Ezra, was the greatest emporium of Oriental trade; much sought unto, yet no less envied, and destroyed, first by Nebuchadnezzar,

then, after seventy years, by Alexander. Isaiah calls it "the joyous city, whose antiquity is of ancient days," "the merchant city, with strongholds," "the crowning city, whose merchants are princes, whose traffickers are the honourable of the earth." (Isaiah xxiii.) And Ezekiel calls it "the abode of seafaring men, the renowned city, strong in the sea, whose terror was upon all that haunted it, situate at the entrance of the sea, a merchant of the people for many isles, whose borders were in the midst of the seas—who was replenished and made very glorious in the midst thereof—who filled many people and enriched the kings of the earth with the multitude of her riches—whose builders had perfected her beauty—and whose prince, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty, sealed up the sum, and was the anointed cherub that covered, in the midst of the stones of fire." (Ezek. xxvi. to xxviii.)

The sin of this city lay chiefly in its usurpation of the place of Jerusalem, in its pride, and in its harlotry. The Lord declared by Ezekiel that He was against Tyre, because she had rejoiced in the breaking of Jerusalem, which had been the gates of the people, and in her own replenishment by the laying waste of that theocratic metropolis of the earth. (Ezek. xxvi. 2.) As to the King of Tyrus, He declared that, his heart being lifted up because of his riches and his beauty, and his sanctuaries being defiled by the iniquity of his traffic, he had set his heart as the heart of God, and said, "I am a god, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas." (Ezek. xxviii. 2, &c.) And Isaiah announced that after Tyre should have lain desolate and been forgotten for a time, she should again turn to her hire, court her lovers with many songs, and commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world. (Is. xxiii. 15, &c.) These three sins bear a most striking analogy to those ascribed, both in the Prophets and in the Apocalypse, to Babylon, as the abode of God's captive people, as the land whose kings were the autocrats of the world, as the city which made all the earth drunken.

The judgment wrought on Tyre was in terms of its sin, and still more remarkably akin to that on Babylon. It became "the destroyed in the midst of the seas." Once a fortress of strength, it was levelled with the ground. The sea, from which Tyre had thriven, and in which it had gloried, was (as with Babylon) made the instrument of its overthrow. Once adorned to the full, it was made bare like the top of a rock; once full of music, it was consigned

to silence; once the joy of the earth, it was made a terror. The report of its overthrow was like to the report of Egypt's plagues. The professed object of the judgment was to stain the pride of all glory. Hence, at the fall of Tyre, as at that of Babylon, all nations lamented, kings looked on amazed, and the earth was moved; and the King of Tyre, being man, and not God, in the hand of him that slew him, was destroyed from the midst of the stones of fire, and made a terror, as Tyre itself, to all.

But there was a blessing in store for Tyre, of which we read no counterpart for Babylon. Not only was Hiram honoured to aid in the building of the temple, under Solomon, the Prince of Peace, but the daughter of Tyre should be there with a gift, when Jesus, the true King of glory, should return to the marriage (Ps. xlv.); and after Tyre should have disclosed her harlotry, her merchandise should be for them that dwelt before the Lord. (Is. xxiii.)

Now what has been the character of Britain? Are not the features of Tyre seen literally in her social position among the nations; and are they not also spiritually fulfilled in the religious influence to which her social position has introduced her? Do not all nations take their tone from her in social progress? Do they not frequent her marts, replenishing her, and replenished by her in turn? Does not her merchant-fleet cover the farthest seas? Does not her enterprise awaken the dormant capabilities of every clime? Has she not made science and trade useful and honourable? Has she not been the bulwark of constitutional liberty, the land where men breathe freely and live secure? Does not her Constitution embrace in wholesome combination elements elsewhere at strife? Has it not been the wonder and envy of the world—that which all well-meant political efforts instinctively imitate? Is she not, with all her faults, the land of practical godliness and large philanthropy? Has she not done more to civilize the world than any other nation, Greece and Rome not excepted?

But, on the other hand, has she not confounded the body of Christ with the body politic, by forgetting the place and usurping the office of the Catholic Church? Has not the religious badge of her children been "Briton," not "Christian"? And, separated from the major part and the mightiest ordinances of the Church of God, has she not reconciled herself to the evils of schism, by sounding the praises of her own Articles, Liturgy, and Succession?

Where are her tears over the lacerated Church of God? where her sense of its palsied weakness? Has she not rather imagined that Britain and the Bible can do all for the world which the Church Catholic and her ordinances could? As Tyre said, "Jerusalem is turned unto me," has not Britain said, "The Church of God is the British Empire"? A light sin this in the eyes of man, but not light in those of God. A state of things which, while it does indicate, totally misrepresents, the true national office which Britain should, and through God's mercy shall, have? Moreover, is not Britain, *κατ' ἐξοχὴν*, the land of pride, both national and personal; fondly deeming herself superior to all, because elevated higher; now an offence and now a laughing-stock to Europe, through her insular sauciness; cursed by those whom she helps; spurned by those whom she leads; the bully of the nations, provoking a thrashing, and on the high road to get it? And are we as exempt from the principles of Antichrist as we have been hitherto exempt from his judgment? While Germans set themselves as God in daring philosophical speculation, and Frenchmen in reckless political change, do not we set ourselves as gods in the use of the creature for the service of man? Are there not heard among us the boastings of Antichrist in our form of utterance, as plainly as with them in theirs? Are not the "inspirations" of the Crystal Palace as much a mockery of the name and Spirit of Christ as the second Pentecost of Young Germany, or the second Incarnation of Young France? Is not the transmutation of religious ordinances into Acts of Parliament as profane as their prostitution on the market-place of intellect? And may not Britain be yet seduced to sell her soul to Antichrist for the maintenance or recovery of her high place among the nations? These are questions worth answering.

What, then, has Britain to fear at the hand of God? That, having corrupted her ways, she shall be put to shame on the very theatre of her glory—that God will read a lesson to the nations by her fall, by her emptying and utter desertion—that the nations shall bring her down, trample her under foot, and then involve her in their own ruin—perhaps by outward force, perhaps by a leaven pervading her internal being, perhaps by both. What is wrought elsewhere by violence, may with us pass through the legitimate forms of Parliament, but the thing done shall be the same.

On the other hand, what has Britain to hope? We have already seen how each of the nations might, by avoiding

their common sin, have escaped their common judgment. We have also seen how Britain, by her avoidance of the sin, did escape the judgment, in that measure in which the sin and the judgment were at the time developed. But England has, at the present crisis, as distinguished from the past, a calling peculiar to herself. Her exemption from the approaching plenitude of judgment will depend not merely on her fidelity to the grace which the nations have hitherto enjoyed in common, but on her fidelity to that larger measure and peculiar form of grace which she is now chosen to receive, in order that she may aid other Christian nations in resisting the most subtle and intense of all temptations—the claims of Antichrist, as the rival of Christ in his three-fold character of prophet, priest, and king.

The prophetic announcements of God, be they threatenings or promises, are not the words of a fortune-teller; and we may not use them as if we were consulting one. They are not given to feed curiosity, to seal despondency, or to sustain presumption by the unalterable oracles of a fate, or to violate the order of nature by turning the future into plain history. The purposes of God are as unchangeable as Himself, but they are not the less unchangeable that His dealings towards men and nations not only change, but often are reversed, with the change or reversal of the course followed by those whom these dealings regard. Indeed, they could not be His dealings if they did otherwise, for they should cease to be the dealings of a moral Governor, of a just and merciful Father. He announced to Nineveh not only the event, but the date of its destruction. Yet the threatening and the date were both falsified. And why? Because the city against which the threat was uttered became no longer that on which it could be executed. Be the words as absolute as they may, their unconditional fulfilment is impossible. They should thus cease to be a moral warning. As there is no blessing, so there is no judgment, save to those who are found worthy of it when it comes.

Grant, then, that Britain, like Tyre of old, is met at every turn by declarations of judgment,—there is no necessity that it should touch her; there is no reason why she should not escape it. If she is no longer the Britain threatened, she shall not be the Britain judged. Let us not be spell-bound by the threatenings of God, as by the decree of a fate. Let us rather rouse ourselves to obviate them all, by putting that away which calls them forth. By this we shall please

Him. It is not His will to vindicate His truth by our ruin. He would rather seem false, if we may be saved. Should we not be as jealous for the truth of His promises as for that of His threatenings? And are not His recent acts in this land the mightiest argument for the former—a living proof that His mercy endureth for ever?

The destruction of the King of Tyre, from among the stones of fire, points to the perversion of the very highest spiritual privileges. But whether the application of this type to Britain be legitimate or not, Holy Scripture affords abundant warrant to expect an advancement of the Church to a spiritual perfection corresponding to the spiritual evil now approaching its full development. "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." A Church without rent or blemish, pure and adorned, is the only true bride of the Lamb. To prove that this shall be, we need not dwell on arguments; we can point to facts; and these facts are found in Britain.

When John the Baptist prepared the way of the Lord, he was declared to be more than a prophet, because he was the *preparer*. At no period of the Christian dispensation have prophets been wanting, who formed pictures of hope and spake words of faith not only concerning the return of our risen Lord, but also concerning the transmutation of the Church, as a temple to which, from its condition, He could not come, into one to which He could. In this particular Britain has not been singular. In her, as elsewhere, have such thoughts and hopes been often revived only to perish with the holy persons who entertained them. But in another respect she has been singular. A Christian *preparer* has (to use the scriptural figure) been raised up in her, to take up and realize the transient visions of the prophets, and to direct the eyes of men to that quarter in which, and that instrumentality by which, God is about to form Christ again in His people, and to restore His temple for the reception of the returning Saviour. In this land especially was a cry, ignorant indeed, yet faithful and united, raised by the contrite, that God would *stir up His power* and come to save us. In this land *first* did He do so. This land first rang with the tidings of His mercy, with the alarm of the trumpet against both the strongholds of bondage and the palaces of lukewarm repose. In this land first did the Spirit of Christ once more break His well-nigh perennial silence, manifest His forgotten presence, fill our

mouth with laughter, and our tongue with singing, and scatter with His light both the darkness and the slumbers of the night, before the day-star arising in our hearts. In this land first did God put to His hand the second time, to rebuild His altar and order the sacrifices thereon—to repair what man had forfeited—to purify what man had defiled—to bring cosmos out of chaos—condescending to the low estate of His people that He might lift them up for ever, settling us on the ancient foundations, building us up in the same faith and fellowship as at the first, gathering the wanderers, comforting the desolate, giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, walking to the lame, cleansing to the lepers, life to the dead, gently accustoming the wounded, wasted, enfeebled body to the food and functions of health. In this land first have the gifts of the Spirit—elsewhere, through lack of culture and guidance, like water spilt upon the ground—been turned, in the congregations of the faithful, to their true use of edifying. In this land first has the eschatology of the Church been rescued out of the theories of disobedient dreamers, and employed in the discipline of obedient children. In this land first has the prediction of our Lord's return been received as a living promise on behalf of the whole Church—a hope for which to labour and by which to purify—a Catholic hope embodied in Catholic congregations who are actually and rapidly going on to perfection in Catholic worship and holy works, serving the living and true God, and waiting for His Son from Heaven, our deliverer from the wrath to come.

In this land *alone* has God called, and by much wonderful discipline trained, the elders of His Universal Church, by whom Jesus, the great Angel of the Covenant, may bind together, bless, and guide her, edifying her unto the measure of the stature of His fulness. In it alone has He aided the weakness, assured the faith, and enlightened the understanding of His people, by constructing, as it were, a microcosm, in which to exhibit the manner of His perfect worship and service, for a pattern to all the baptized, τα αισθητως ἱερα των νοητων απεικονισματα, και επ' αὐτα χειραγωγια και ὁδος. In this land alone has He appointed a centre, not the throne of earthly empire, or the chair of exaggerated episcopate, but the seat of Apostles, as Jerusalem of old, from which shall go forth His power and law, and in the unity of which the Catholic Church shall find both symbol and basis for her own. The things which have burst upon Europe with resistless surprise are the very things which God has foreshowed, in this land, to

those who would hear His word, who, like Abraham, have been His friends, and who alone, forewarned and thus forearmed, are not overtaken as by a thief. From this land alone has the voice of mercy, the work of restoration, the plerophory of blessing, gone forth. And as, in the beginning, the seal of Apostleship was found in the Churches which Apostles builded, so is the seal of this work, at the end of the age, to be found in the European Churches—in the baptized, out of every land and communion, made alive to their baptismal unity and privileges—in the lost sheep gathered into folds—in the faithful led on towards perfection, with a speed which astonishes themselves—in the change from death to life, from darkness to light, from doubt to certainty—from despair to hope, from discontent to patience, from trouble to peace, from confusion to order, from falsehood to truth, from hatred to love—from infidelity, on the one hand, and schism on the other, to the real catholicity of faith—from the uniformity of death to the unity of life. For the first time since the Apostolic Age does Christendom now contain in its bosom government truly œcumenic, worshippers and worship truly Catholic, Christians really needing and using all others as members of a body, believers soberly expecting to see the Lord, and occupying till He come,—living examples, in part, of what should pervade the whole—not a new piece on an old garment, or new wine in old bottles, but both new—not a heterogeneous element injected to fester all around it, but a healing begun in some members, that it may extend to the rest by the legitimate circulation of a common life—not the predominance of one section to the extinction of the rest, or the introduction of novel conceits in contempt of things existing,—but the due recognition, selection, adjustment, and fuller development of all that has been or is of God, in any part of His Church. In this phenomenon lies the divine panacea for the evils of our age; not the false and, even though true, idle *dogma* of the blessed Virgin's immaculate conception, but the *divine fact* now appearing and yet to be fully seen—that holy virgin, the Church of God, pregnant with the future glory of Christ in His saints—that Queen, whose children shall be instead of her fathers, whose name, more than Mary's, shall be remembered in all generations, and who shall be praised for ever by the people, for an achievement of faith analogous to, yet transcending, her's. (Ps. xlv.) This work is the banner given to them that fear God. In Britain has this banner been

displayed. In all this Britain is the honoured agent. God has used her to lead the way. We may not, indeed, confound Britain with the Church in Britain, by transferring to the former conclusions belonging to the latter. And we surely believe that to be taken out of this world and caught up to meet the Lord in the air, will be the only ultimate escape from the things that are coming both on the earth and on all that prefer abode on earth to citizenship in Heaven. But it is consistent with the whole analogy of God's dealings to believe that, till that time arrive, He will not leave His people without a local refuge on earth, that He will not arbitrarily change the site of that refuge, and that the nation which has been the cradle of His grace, and which is yet the central theatre of His working, the fulcrum, so to speak, or *πov στω* of His power, shall not share the fate of others, if it be faithful to this its pre-eminent calling.

Here, then, lies the true turning-point of Britain's destiny. Does she acknowledge or ignore this act of God? Does she welcome and cherish, or does she dislike, and would she expel, that which He has established in the heart of her body politic? Does she prefer, or not, her unsupported, chemically resolved episcopacy, or her Church by grace of Parliament, to this perfect way of God? Does she hasten or delay to accept the blessing of the latter? Does she honestly and thankfully confess its source? Is she, or would she gladly be, pervaded by its virtue? Does she, or will she, as a nation, live and move, devise and determine, act and suffer, for its sake? Will she use her best legitimate influence to recommend it to other nations, and renounce, if need be, for its sake, her national interests and pre-eminence? Or, in this day, when God shall be known in His holy habitation as the Father of the fatherless and the Judge of the widows, will she cast in her lot with those nations which decree unrighteous decrees, to make widows their prey, rob the fatherless, turn aside the right of the needy, and thus call down His judgment? Such are the questions which she must ask and answer; for on her practical answer to these, and not on the changes of politics, the currents of trade, or the chances of war, does it depend, whether God, who has hitherto so signally saved her, will now reject her, or whether He will honour her now more highly than ever, and identify her cause with His, because she counts that which He has planted within her, not only the hope of the Church and the health of the world, but the palladium of her own national being.

If she follow the better alternative, she has nothing to fear. They who come up against her shall return as they came. The vessel of her state shall bound over every billow, as the ark did in the days of old. The wings of the Assyrian may darken all Immanuel's land, but there shall be light in her tabernacles. The flood may reach to the neck, but the Head, and they who hold by Him, through joints and bands of His appointment, shall not be submerged. That day, in which God cuts off from Babylon the *name* and *remnant* and *son* and *nephew*, in which he breaks the Assyrian in His land and treads him under foot on His mountains (Is. xiv. 22), shall be the day of our national redemption. And God shall have His elected one among the nations, as well as His undefiled one among the Churches. This nation shall be the handmaid of the Church, the helper of other lands; and her merchandise, no longer the substitute for spiritual grace, or the hire of national harlotry, shall find its true employment in the service of the redeemed.

In this, man's transition state, still bearing a curse removed, already tasting a blessing unrevealed, it is idle to ask, and presumptuous to dictate, in what measure, on any given occasion, we are to be exempt from the former and partakers of the latter. This we must humbly refer to Him who mingleth mercy with judgment. We may neither seek to evade the chastisement of sons, nor appropriate the fate of enemies. If we suffer, we are judged of the Lord, that we may not perish with the wicked. But, if we will judge ourselves, we shall not be judged. If we are to fall, let us fall into the hands of the Lord, not into those of men. The axe has no mercy; the hewer has. But we need not fall. If the living will seek no longer to the dead, but to their God, He shall be their sanctuary. No weapon formed against them shall prosper; and from Him who dwelleth in Zion shall they be for signs and for wonders.

THE
DOOR OF HOPE FOR CHRISTENDOM.

"There is hope in thine end."

JEREMIAH xxxi. 17.

1853.

1840

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
1892

THE DOOR OF HOPE FOR CHRISTENDOM.

. . . . Sparsaque matris
Collige membra tuæ.

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus.

THE present condition of Christendom, and the consequent prospects of men, are without a parallel in the history of the world. Never was a deeper enigma, and never less power to solve it. The ancient order of things is ready to vanish away. A new order arises, to which experience affords no key; full of hope to some—of fear to others—of mystery to all; by some hailed as the kingdom of promise—by others dreaded as the triumph of evil—by all observed with intense expectation. Society stands over a dismal chasm, to the brink of which a stern necessity has brought it. Some shrink from the leap. All seek a beacon, brighter than they have, to guide them across the gulf. Some think they have found it in the light of Satan; others wait for it in the light of God. Mediæval politics and mediæval religion, while they amuse the secure or yield a transient comfort to the timorous, can here afford as little real aid as mediæval tournaments or mediæval architecture. Saul, answered no longer by Urim, may enlist the witch to help him in his necromancy; yet the rebuke of Samuel is all that he can thus obtain. Our God is the God of hope. He who is raised from the dead is still the leader of His people; and He is to be found, not in retreating upon the past, but in discerning His present grace, as our armour for the conflict and preparation for the crown.

While there are now, as of old, two, of whom one must be loosed and the Other crucified, there are also two hands stretched out to them that grope in the dark—the hand of Satan and the hand of Christ. It is not enough to have found a hand; our fate depends on which we lay hold of.

The issues are too momentous for the biting irony of censors, the cold schemes of theorists, or the brilliant sketches and spicy antitheses of pamphleteers. There is no lack of men ready to amuse—to hit the blots of our social condition—to depict the present evil—to predict the future; but the wretchedness of their nostrums for the healing of the patient betrays how little they possess the true diagnosis of the disease, or the mind of the Great Physician.

It has well been said that no authority can now stand but that which is based on either instinct or inspiration. The present instinct of Christendom warrants the hope of supernatural help. And nothing can afford this but inspiration—the word of Christ to go forth—His power to be stirred up—His hand to be plucked out of His bosom—His presence to be known as at the first—Urim and Thummim to be restored to God's Christian Israel. So shall we be saved indeed, because saved of God. This forms the subject of the following pages.

Although eternity is a distinctive attribute of God, that which He has once created shall never be annihilated. But, though the substance of the creature endures, the continual destruction of its forms proves that it has not yet attained to its final condition. That same faith by which we understand that the things which we see have their origin, not in pre-existing phenomena, but in the word of God, is also the substance of things hoped for. And, of the two errors, viz., unbelief in the creation of the creature, and unbelief in its true destination, the latter, although the most general, is the least excusable. It were a thing incredible, did not experience prove it, that men could contemplate the phenomena of death without the conviction that those subject to it are not as God made them, or as He would yet have them to be; in other words, that death is the wages of sin, and the last enemy to be vanquished. No less strange is it that men can contemplate the existing state of society without the conviction that such it should not be and cannot continue. And yet more wonderful is it, that Christian men can regard the existing state of Christendom as its normal and abiding condition.

Yet we know that the besetting sin of Christians in all ages has been, to substitute, for the patience of faith, that contentment with existing things which springs from ignorance of, and unbelief in, the destiny of Christendom. And the Apostle Peter specially informs us that the close of this dispensation shall be preceded by a spiritual supine-

ness, in which men shall say, "Where is the promise of His coming, for all things continue as they were?"—by which they shall be brought into the attitude of scoffers at the promises and purposes of God, and out of which they cannot be rescued, save by becoming mindful again of the words of the prophets and of the commandments of the Apostles of the Lord and Saviour. This prediction we find verified in diverse forms throughout the whole Christian Church. The worship of the Greek is indeed overladen with scenic representation of the future glory. The Romish polity virtually claims to be that of the kingdom come; and, among the Protestant Churches, death is regarded as the vestibule to the rest prepared for the people of God. But the Greek is content with the mere scene. The Romanist, grasping at that which flesh and blood cannot inherit, has the mere apotheosis of things earthly. And the Protestants, forgetting that the people of God are "one body," wait no longer for that rest which all shall have "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from Heaven." Although we are eighteen centuries nearer than those who waited at the first, no one of the great divisions of the Christian Church is now found waiting for the Son of God from Heaven, looking for and hasting to the coming of the day of God. All corporate ecclesiastical action is directed to the objects of man. It would be disturbed, not crowned, by the advent of Christ. And while the creed of every Christian Church declares its faith in the return of the Lord to judge both quick and dead, no Church holds fast that return as its hope. It may be the faith of devils, who believe and tremble—it may be an impotent event in the indefinite future of speculation; but it no longer stands in place of death at the end of our vista. It is no longer that for which those who, in the sad order of fallen nature, must fall asleep until it occurs, are believed to long, and by the hope of which those who are alive and remain are purified. Men nowhere act as if the Christian dispensation had an end, or as if they could possibly see it. All reckon on being first unclothed, none on being clothed upon at once with our house which is from Heaven. The best expect only that life shall *succeed* mortality; none hope to see life *swallow it up*. (2 Cor. v. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17.)

But those who lose sight of the goal cannot know the true dangers of the course. Those solemn, in many forms reiterated, words—"That day shall not come, except there come THE falling away first"—seem, like God's warning

to the Jews, and, through them, to us, as if written in vain. The pious dreams of modern Protestants, indeed—that the empty cistern of the Church can fill the nations, or can fill itself in dripping upon them; and that, by the gradual extension of the truth, the world shall unexpectedly find itself converted, and peaceably slide into the estate of God's kingdom, as an amorphous commonwealth of love without Him that loved us,—these ideas were wholly unknown to our fathers. The primitive saints did expect an apostasy as the prelude of the Lord's return; but they erred, some in not seeing its universality, others in mistaking its true ultimate character. In later centuries, the Church, vaunting herself in the letter of God's promises on her behalf, without taking care to be the holy subject of them, has become lapped in oblivious security by that which should have stimulated her faith. And, while it cannot be denied that apostasy, in a nascent and crescent form, has been successively developed under various phases in Christendom, the same strange mistake, by which *heathen* persecutors were of old regarded as the apostates of Christendom, has shown itself in the readiness with which, at every fresh schism of the Church, the contending parties have denounced each other as the full development of apostasy. But we need be in no darkness as to the nature of that apostasy which is to be the great precursor of the day of God. We read expressly that it is universal lawlessness headed up in the rule of the lawless one. Not mere disorder, but overthrow of God's order; not mere chaos, but the cosmos of man; not absence of power, but power divorced from God; not absence of law, but the substitution of human will for divine; not mere profanity, but religion devised by man; not mere sensuality, but spiritual pride; in one word, the practical denial, in every form, religious, social, and personal, that man has been made and redeemed by another; the denial of the Father and the Son, and the rejection of the Holy Ghost, that monitor and guide, who enforces the claims of both; man showing himself that he is God; the work saying of Him that made it, "He made me not, I am my own maker;" the thing framed saying of Him that framed it, "He hath no understanding, I can better frame myself." This is the thing to be feared. For this all around us is now preparing. For this is Satan, as a skilful fisher, now baiting variously all his hooks, with baits both for the pious and for the impious. Into this great snare of the fowler are men now daily inveigled. And not

by idle common-places, by vague generalities, and by the efforts, isolated or concerted, of fantastic piety, but by seeing this snare, and avoiding it, by doing all things which those should do who are under the constitution of a Maker and a Redeemer, by abiding in that which we have heard from the beginning, by continuing in the Father and in the Son, filled with the Holy Ghost, and so going on to perfection in the communion of the Christian Church, as the body of Christ, shall we break that Satanic spell which now works its fascination on the children of God, with every protestation of innocence and promise of good, with all cogent arguments, and all convincing signs. "We ought to know," says a Father of the Church, "that the enemy will endeavour to imitate, with cunning fraud, to the deception of the faithful, the saving advent of Christ; and, instead of the Son of Man, who is expected to come in the majesty of His Father, to bring forth the son of perdition, with prodigies and signs, that he may introduce into this world Antichrist for Christ. . . . This error is foretold through prophets, evangelists, and apostles, lest any should mistake the advent of Antichrist for that of Christ."

Moreover, although the primitive Church was aware of the spiritual temptation and calamity which should precede the second coming of Christ, she had not that comfort and hope, under the prospect of these things, which God will vouchsafe to those in whose days they occur. The Fathers who treated of the final delusions and sufferings under Antichrist, and of the apostasy into which so many should be seduced or terrified, did indeed also console the Church by picturing the signal fidelity of a remnant; but they saw for that remnant nothing but the crown of martyrdom. It was not granted to them to see that last great deliverance which perfected fidelity should earn. That multitudes of the faithful, failing of a better crown, shall yet earn the crown of martyrdom, by nobly refusing to acknowledge the universal lie, is plainly announced in Scripture; but it is no less plainly there announced, in various forms of type and prophecy, that certain of the faithful, improving that grace and embracing that help of God which are bestowed on, and held out to, all the baptized in common, shall so perfect holiness in His fear, and follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth, that they shall receive a promise addressed to all, but not by all embraced. These shall escape that last hour of temptation which comes upon all the earth; and, instead of awaiting the descent of the Lord, to destroy

Antichrist and avenge their blood, they shall be caught up to meet Him in the air, and be employed by Him in His work of judgment. And thus, being the first-fruits of the future harvest, the ears ripened by the fire of God, they shall be presented in His heavenly temple, as an earnest of those yet to be ripened in the fire of tribulation, and as a pledge of final deliverance to their brethren.

Let this suffice to show what our position is, what we have to avoid, what we have to do, and what we have to hope.

But is this final crisis near?

Time is merely the succession of events. Its lapse is measured by the observation of their occurrence, in the natural, in the intelligent, or in the spiritual world. Arithmetic measures it by those days, months, and years which the heavenly bodies have been set to indicate; philosophy, by events affecting man's present state; faith, by events affecting his future destiny. Therefore the measurement of time should differ according to the aspect in which time is regarded. And its measurement in one aspect is as true as its measurement in another. There can be no time for Him who sees the end from the beginning. With Him, one day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. And they who stand in His counsels are, in so far as these are concerned, superior to natural time. Hence faith is called not only the evidence of unseen transactions, but the hypostasis or substance of things hoped for; and the faithful escape, by God's promises, the corruption that is in the world through lust or desire, by being the mystery of His future kingdom, and desiring nothing that is of this world. Grace, indeed, does not abolish nature. In so far as we are mere creatures, we reckon time according to the physical laws of the world; and in so far as we are mere intelligent creatures, we reckon it by those events which affect society. Both reckonings are legitimate, and recognized by God Himself in His dealings with men. But in so far as our position transcends that of mere intelligent creatures—in so far as we have fellowship with the Father and the Son—we are not only entitled, but bound to reckon time by a much higher calendar. Such is the only reckoning that is essentially and eternally true.

The time, therefore, at which any promise of God shall be fulfilled, does not depend on the lapse of years, but on the preparation of those who shall obtain it. The Lord calls the interval between His first and His second appearing, "a

little while." He appeared "in the end of the world," "in the last of the days." And the Apostle says, "The time is short." The duration of the world for 1,800 years longer has not made this untrue. The fact, that the Christian dispensation has lasted so long, has not altered its character in the eyes of God. And why? Because the Christian dispensation is the time during which man, having, through baptism, attained, and being by heavenly food strengthened to keep, the highest place to which he can be advanced, is undergoing that final preparation for reigning with Christ in which the patriarchal and legal dispensations find their common completion. What though the Jews, after being brought at once to the borders of the promised land, wandered forty years in the wilderness? God had not, therefore, changed His purpose. He took up its fulfilment where it had been broken off. What though the Christian Church, set on the highway of salvation, has for eighteen centuries retrograded and erred? The promise of God has not failed. He reckons not by centuries as we. The character of the dispensation has not changed. It is still, though composed of many scenes, the last act in the drama of the world that is. God has seen how we have spoiled the work; He will take it up and finish it. And then there shall be time no longer. In other words, then shall the succession of stages end in completion; then shall the scaffolding give place to the building.

Now, it is universally observable that, at any great crisis in the history either of the world, of nations, or of men, the events in which it consists follow, according to the natural reckoning of time, in rapid and yet more rapid succession. This phenomenon in the natural world is a symbol of what proceeds in the spiritual. If it is the zeal of the Lord of Hosts that shall, when He stirs up His power, both lead on the Church rapidly, in the way of His appointment, to that perfection which men have proved themselves unable either to devise or to attain, and also bring on a judgment which they shall not be able to avert, we may well expect that, in strict analogy with His former dealings, He will do both with a speed which baffles all the calculations of man. And nothing affords more conclusive practical evidence that the end is near than the features of oecumenic history during the last seventy years. Every occasion on which God has raised up judges to work even transitory deliverance for Christendom—every successive striving of His oppressed Spirit to form His Christ anew in

His people—every successive labour-throe which has both indicated and brought nearer the ultimate birth of the man-child,—has exhibited the crowding together of decisive events. But if this has been the case with transitory efforts, how much more shall it be seen at the final struggle! And do not both the universality and the peculiar character of the present crisis stand strikingly contrasted with the features of all similar crises that are past? The first French Revolution, that galvanization of the dead body of Christendom, which so many mistook for resurrection, was the beginning of the end. What has succeeded is its progress. The sins of Christendom, both civil and religious, then called down the judgment of God. It came in the form of the godless indignation of man, who, breaking at once the chains of bondage and the bands of truth, called both monarchy and Providence to his bar. At many a former period had the world seen that trine rotation of crops in the cycles of its wickedness,—order abused, disorder triumphant, tyranny established; but never so clearly as then. Judgment began at the House of God. Christendom, as the theatre of judgment, was made a spectacle to the world. God withdrew His hand; the fabric trembled and crumbled to dust. He vindicated His blasphemed Name; and they on whom He had set it, while personally comparatively innocent, tasted the sour grape eaten of their fathers, and lost their wisdom, place, and power. The shield of Saul was cast away, as though he had not been anointed with oil. Nebuchadnezzar, to whose golden image men had bowed idolatrous, was sent down to dwell among the beasts, till he should confess that not “a mortal God upon earth,” but “the heavens did rule,” and that God could abase them who walked in pride. In the orgies of Belshazzar—the orgies of Satan’s new Cosmos—every sacred vessel was desecrated; every good institution and ordinance of God trodden down; every God, as in ancient Rome, worshipped, but the true; till at length, not the hospital, for healing, but the strait-waistcoat, the prison, and the treadmill, for dire correction, received the exhausted maniacs and bacchanals who had already dreamed themselves in the land of promise. And a tyranny emerged; not the dew upon the mown grass, not the rule of Jesus over the penitent, but the destroying hail; grace transformed into judgment; the rule of Satan over his impenitent freedmen; the dread taskmaster imposed of God over those who would neither impose nor wear the easy yoke of Christ. From this we should learn not the mere sins of

revolutionary ambition, but those sins which by it were punished. Occupied merely with the former, we shall have been smitten in vain; we shall but lull our own conscience to repose in pious abhorrence of other men's sins, and shall have learned no salutary lesson. Occupied with the latter, we shall repent and improve.

But how stood the ministers of Christ? The Church is appointed of God to be "the salt of the earth," and the "city set on a hill," under the dread alternative of becoming the great corrupter of the earth—the beacon misleading to ruin. She cannot while away her existence in fat and easy neutrality. She is either the best or the worst of all things; the fountain of blessing or of curse; the mystery of godliness, or the cradle of apostasy. We read of a harlot, seated upon a beast, decked out with ornament, guilty of blood, but afterwards hated, devoured, and destroyed. Such, although as yet only in a modified sense and imperfect measure, had the Church become—the concubine of kings, the adulteress bedizened of the nations, indulgent to man's life, cruel to the life of God. The day came at length, when, to a certain extent, the people threw her off in disgust, and when her sons, faithful or faithless, paid, in exile or death, the penalty of her sin. But herein lay a ground of hope for the Church, and a proof that the judgment under which Europe then groaned had not reached its uttermost—that the Christian priesthood, as a body, did not consent to the lie. The Antichrist of that day did not exhibit a full development. In him the political element predominated; the religious element was comparatively unseen. Napoleon did indeed talk of his destiny; receive, as a *quasi* Messiah, the homage of apostate Jews; did, in the climes of Mahomet, emulate that heathen Antichrist, in weaving every true religion up into a lie, and thought to worship every God. But it went no further. When revolution set reason and obscenity on the throne of Christ, new-made priests were needed for the new-made worship. Hardly a Christian priest was thought enlightened enough, or found base enough, for such a ministry. And the Pope, while forced to take part in the pageant of autocratic inauguration, failed not to vindicate, in some measure, his Master's honour, and left the crown of empire to reach the head of ambition as it best might. Would that even so much fidelity now survived! Whether a more abandoned woman shall yet bestride a more blasphemous beast—whether tyrants in God's name, and tyrants in man's name, shall

yet find a false prophet who will thoroughly serve the turn of their monstrous alliance, the sequel may tend to show.

There perhaps never was a political contest in which the victors had a stronger persuasion that they were fighting for God, than the great war of European liberation. And many of the political measures which followed it did indicate a salutary change of mind, similar to that of Nebuchadnezzar when restored to his kingdom. But as the breaking off of sins by righteousness and mercy might have prevented the judgment, so should a similar line of conduct, heartily adopted and pursued, have been the right token of radical amendment. This, alas! did not appear. The awe which had rested on men's minds gradually wore off. The lessons which they had learned were effaced from their memory. As self-interest resumed its sway, trust in God necessarily decreased. Worldly objects revived worldly counsels. And, in the course of a decennary or two, the rulers of Christendom relapsed into their old policy, like fathers without a father's heart, vexing their children with exaction and irritating tutelage, instead of rising up into their patriot place, as devout, intelligent, and disinterested governors of redeemed and conscious manhood.

But their subjects did not relapse with them. The taste of liberty had whetted the appetite. Bondage, once ignorantly borne, became doubly irksome when re-imposed. The wild beast lost all prescriptive reverence for the weak bars of its cage. The masses, disappointed of that recognition which was their due and might have been their salvation, lusted after licence, while seeming to long for liberty. Resolved to live no more for those who would not live for them, they questioned the divine right to govern when divorced from the divine obligation to govern well. Every repression strengthened their resolution and confirmed their faith, while it exercised their patience. They became Satan's forgery of sainthood. They bided their time, as the prisoners of hope, waiting for their Messiah. "Tie up a vein, you have disease—dam a stream, inundation—close the future, revolution." The occasions of great crises are not their causes. Where the cause lies deep, any occasion will serve. "*Sic vos non vobis*" was the rankling cause. The occasion soon came.

In 1848, or rather in the end of 1847, at an era marked out by most students of prophecy for a fresh development of antagonist evil and good, the key of the bottomless pit—the key of the well of the abyss—was again put in requisi-

tion. The Church, like an angel fallen from Heaven, having exchanged the wisdom of fidelity to God for the shortsighted policy of pandering to men, had the sad privilege of taking the lead in letting loose those lying spirits who, issuing from the smoke of infidel obfuscation, overspread, like locusts, the earth, and devoured, with voracity unparalleled, the remnant of truth and life. Not till the Pope had, by his acts of homage to the Roman revolution, given the spiritual signal, did the volcano come to fresh eruption at its old Parisian crater, in a nation styled by man the right hand of the Church, in that mysterious place on which, since Julian the apostate there arose, the eyes of mankind have ever and anon been fixed as on the fountain of their destiny. The most politic of governments was put instantly and utterly at fault. Webs of police, masses of troops, were in vain, as tools without a workman; and he who should have used them, paralyzed, decamping, was as if he had never been. The new concussion was not confined, as formerly, to one land; it shook all Europe. The eruption was no longer seen from afar, issuing from a single outlet, round which men justly drew a hedge—offensive in form, but defensive in fact. As by electric sympathy, other mouths of hell were opened. In almost every land the mine was sprung. An evil conscience lent speed to flying rulers. Hypocrisy feigned conversion, and penned concession. Clergy, one week loyal to the heart's core, consecrated rebellion and canonized rebels the next. The sea boiled, and the scum came to the top. The mightiest changes were wrought by the most ordinary men; for the storm commanded the spirits, not they the storm. The beast had again arisen; the mighty were again afraid. But their pretended change of mind, and too ready pledges, earning contempt while they purchased safety, quieted his rage. Once more he trusted the word of his keepers; and he let himself be muzzled, while they stroked and pampered him.

The word passed was not kept. No sooner did the tempest abate—no sooner did the renovators of the body politic come to a stand, exhausted, in confessed incompetence, by their fruitless efforts to build upon the sand—than the so-called friends of order, who had fled, lest the ruin should be under their hand, the major part as godless and selfish as their opponents, crept out of their hiding-places. Some, the more honest, who had already purchased respect from their enemies by manly avowal and consistent action,

rallied military force, and restored the *status quo*; while others, who had made concessions, emboldened by the success of the bold, used their own pledges as wadding for artillery. Some invoked logic to prove their obligations null or cancelled; some, with a loop-hole in every promise, set themselves, in fresh treachery, to stultify every constitutional provision, under pretence of its patriotic fulfilment. And now, success has quieted both consciences and fears. European repose, however superficial, has rendered men secure, at least furnished a pretext for self-delusion. The Courts now hold their accustomed festivities, amid the ruins of public credit. The troops, half hated, and more than half infected—an idol, half powerless, half pregnant with danger—hold their accustomed parades. Effeminate supineness and rigorous surveillance are seen in incongruous mixture. On one hand, the slumberers resume their slumbers; on the other, the wakeful redouble their precautions. “The danger is past, let us take our rest again,” say some; “surprise is now impossible, let us tighten the screw,” say others. And a third class, reckless and selfish as the spendthrift life-renters of a ruined estate, live as they list on what they judge will only last their time. Thus has “the little finger become thicker than the father’s loins;” thus are corrupted institutions given up to infatuated suicide; thus is the safety-valve of society closed. Men dream that they have regained the *status quo*. But there is no such thing in the world as return to the *status quo*. Reaction aggravates tenfold former evils, makes wise concession tenfold more difficult, and identifies just and healing policy with defeat. When all reform has to be extorted, and the sacred prestige of rule is dispelled by the sin or infatuation of those who bear it, there is nothing left but a trial of brute strength. Then the masses must gain the day; and when they gain it, they will trust reaction no longer, but yield to Nemesis a perfect retribution. The tinder is there; it needs but the spark. One twist more may snap the cord. The stillness is deep, but only the more portentous. All men feel the calm; none but the judicially blind dare call it peace. The limbs of Antichrist have changed their tactics and their battle-field. They are learning the strategy of veterans. They renounce all useless outposts and idle skirmishings. They reserve their fire till they can exterminate. They will be partisans no more, for they deem all parties alike unworthy of trust. They are resolved to make all things new, and exchange ideas for possession.

And they have one for them—Satan at their right hand—who can blind the lynx eye of all police, overleap every frontier cordon, and turn every bayonet against its maker. While others are groping without light, wandering without compass, irresolute in their very resolves, they are perfectly aware what they would have, and how to obtain it. They have faith in their God.

But is there no repentance in reaction? Has no lesson been learned and laid to heart? Doubtless we may not judge by mere appearances. There may be many hidden ones on whom these events have told—who know the true burden of the Lord—who shed salt tears of penitence—who heave the sigh of earnest intercession—and who yearn for a European repentance like that of Nineveh. But, besides the masses, who are too brutish to comprehend, and too slothful or proud to hear, the rebuke of God—besides the increasing number who are intoxicated with the wine of Satan's coming kingdom,—there is a very numerous class who, although still conscious of responsibility to God, alive to the need of His help, and aware of the conditions of His favour, are nevertheless so blind to their real position, and to the question truly at issue, as to adopt a course which can end only in disappointment. With them, retaining little more than the obstinate, one-sided prejudice of legitimacy—unable to recognize the divine element in social constitutions, save in its traditionary garb, and unaccustomed to yield the same respect to the right of the ruled as to that of the ruler,—concession to popular clamour is the great sin which sits heavy on their conscience. They feel that they have in this been untrue to God. Till they are clear of this burden, they have no confidence to act in the faith of His help; and they are willing to make any sacrifice in order to obtain that help. So far has this feeling gone as to bring forth the grave proposal that the Princes of Europe shall with one consent appoint a day of humiliation for the sins of concession, receive solemn absolution from the ministers of Christ, and, having thus appeased the displeasure of God, set themselves in good earnest to rule with unlimited sway! Bad enough it is to be indifferent whether God has a controversy with us or no; and equally bad to be in confessed ignorance of its nature. For those in such a condition, however, there is always hope that their conscience may yet be awakened and enlightened. But to lay asleep a conscience already awakened, and thus frustrate the labour of God, by finding out false burdens and

causes of banishment, is a far more dangerous thing. In the eyes of that true Saviour who will have none but a radical cure, it is no slight crime to heal slightly the hurt of His people. To them which say, "We see," He saith, "Your sin remaineth." What a blindness to think that concession is the head and front of offending in the rulers; or, that the last in the series of their errors is therefore the worst, because it differs in character from its predecessors! Whatever unfaithfulness may have attended such concessions (and they were both unmanly, untrue, and to Christ most unloyal), they were rather the fruit and exponent of the sin, than the sin itself. That sin is to be sought in those things which forced the concessions—in those abuses of power against which the clamour arose, or which furnished that wicked clamour with its fair pretext—in the centuries, to man's eye past and gone, but yet present to God, during which the shepherds had fed and clothed themselves, but starved, oppressed, and deserted the flock. "We, with our fathers, have sinned," is the language of true discernment and humble penitence. From the beginning of Christian politics hitherto have the omissions and commissions of those intrusted by God with the welfare and guidance of others accumulated into a fearful catalogue—to be of this generation required. The children do but reap that retribution which the fathers have called down by centuries of misdeeds; and before God judges His flock, He will judge the shepherds and require it at their hand. What though the clamour be mad? What though the principles of those who raise it be antichristian? What though the imagined blessings which they would have are even more contrary to the Divine will than the evils against which they raise the outcry? For all that they shall answer. But, when the brute creature is hurt, it cries out; and he who hurts it has the blame of any violence it may do. For that which men have suffered at the hands of their rulers, shall their rulers answer. And if men have been hurried into wickedness by that arch-deceiver, who takes for his pretext the redress of wrongs, the sins of rulers are only aggravated by becoming the occasion of sin in their subjects. The testimony of truth is due to all men alike. No man is too high to need it. The higher, he needs it the more. And no man is too low to be worthy of it. The lower, the greater its comfort. But it is mere trifling, or worse, to admonish the wrong parties. It is the work of a sycophant to read lectures to kings on the duties of subjects; and

none but a mover of sedition would read lectures to subjects on the duties of kings. Each man should be told that which practically affects his own conduct; and he should be told it to his face. It is easy to be bold behind men's backs, and wise in other men's affairs. Where there is neither courage to address the right person, nor wisdom to say the right thing, all discourse upon duty is the mere slander of cowardice. If the rulers of Christendom will hear the truth,—spoken in love, not in accusation,—and will honestly examine their ways in order to obtain deliverance from God, they will never content themselves with a sham penance for secondary sins, which leaves the primary untouched. But, while yielding the dignity of their crowns to none, they will humbly apply themselves to learn, in the House of God, how they should wear them. They will escape from the gins of flatterers, partisans, and carnal counsellors. They will take counsel of men uniting wisdom, talent, and experience, with that wisdom and understanding which consist in the fear of God and the departing from evil. They will prove their divine right by their divine conduct, by standing for Christ's truth in the bowels of His mercies, and taking heed lest they inaugurate the reform of their ways by wrathful rejection of God's help.

But the object proposed in the above scheme is as unworthy as the means are preposterous. The main problem is the mere recovery of power; power to be purchased by penance, not to be sanctified through penitence. The narrow vision and sordid desires of such men embrace nothing better than the maintenance of their own position. How they shall behave therein, whether they shall fulfil or frustrate the purpose of God, in giving it to them, concerns them little. While they appeal to Christ for their right, they will not follow Him in their duty. And their conscience is constantly defiled, by requiring the observance of one set of divine laws while they themselves infringe another equally binding. Thus acting, they cast off Christ as thoroughly as do the agents of revolution. If the latter reject His holy rule of love, the former pervert it. If the latter reject divine right, the former profane it. If the latter cast off authority, the former will not use it in obedience to its author. Resisting the Holy Ghost, both parties agree in denying the Father and the Son. The ancient dragon, whose ancestors are his only deeds, and the modern beast, whose deeds are his ancestors; the tyrant from above, with his prestige, and the tyrant from beneath,

with his promises—however dissimilar in history and appearance—are the offspring of one evil parent, the flesh of man, and the enemies of one sacred Person, the Lamb of God. Diverse as their works and conflicting as their interests may occasionally be, their heart is one; and the false prophet who serves them is one. They are both counterfeits of truth;—the dragon, of that lordship over man which has been given to the Son of Man, but which He uses for the blessing of men, not for His own exaltation;—the beast, of that dignity of the redeemed man which is sanctified by the obedience of faith, and not grasped at to justify self-government. If a choice can be made between the two lies, the latter is perhaps the nobler, and does more homage to God's purpose with man than the former. But, be this as it may, the consummation of wickedness will exhibit the two reconciled—the one the complement of the other—the one passing over into the other—a harmony of falsehood like the harmony of truth—bondage and lawlessness, where rule and liberty should be.

Do we not see this already begun? That the overthrow of one rule which is divine should generate another which is human; that democracy should pass over into dictatorship; or, as it has been well said, that a government which is on the street should find its way to the barrack,—is no new phenomenon. This is at once the chastisement of rebellion, and the testimony extorted from rebels that man is made to rule and to be ruled. But, that such a dictatorship should receive the spontaneous hand of brotherhood from hereditary right divine, is a new thing in the earth. The ancient head of Christian empire was once forced to swallow, as a bitter pill, the alliance of his daughter with an upstart who sought to tie himself on to pedigree. But who now rush the first to welcome an authority which boasts itself upstart, and, in unsought servility, to punish all who would demand its pedigree? They to whose whole history, position, and principles it stands in most revolting contrast, and who would otherwise treat it with supercilious contempt. And why? Because, having no higher thought than how to keep men down, and being hard pushed for the means of doing so, they hail any ally who will help them in that selfish work, without inquiring whether he comes from above or from beneath, whether he serves God or Satan. Thus have the parricidal child of liberty and the unnatural father of rule met on common ground. "The grace of God" and "the will of the people," hitherto the mottoes of

deadliest strife, figure harmonious on one new escutcheon adopted into the heraldry of nations ! And as the exclusive Jew was fain to court the despised Gentile, in persecuting Christ and His members, so have hereditary and upstart empire combined to expunge all remaining ideas of Christian government. They may yet be parted by occasional incongruities ; but they shall be summed up in one man at the last—the professed solver of all problems, the reconciler of all antagonisms, the deliverer of exhausted humanity from all its perplexities, struggles, and evils—Lucifer, son of the morning.*

And how stands the Church affected now ? Have the priests been faithful ; or, at least, stood aloof, as before ? Alas ! their altered conduct affords one of the strongest proofs of how much and how rapidly our case has become worse. That these events have sifted them, and, for many, broken the spell of their infatuation, we cannot doubt ; but the faithful are as yet hidden. The unfaithful, daily deteriorating, fill the picture. Should we not blush and tremble to think that, at this crisis, when deeds of blasphemy are done, and delusions spread, which no other age has seen, and which challenge the exposure and vengeance of God, the ministers of Christ are silent ; no word, quick and powerful, is spoken ; no voice of protest before Heaven, no voice of warning to man, is raised ; no trumpet gives a certain sound, and none are ready for the battle. But, oh ! how much more so, when the servants of God are found veering like the weather-cock, and adapting their venal consciences to the basest prostitution of their office ! That religious element in the character of Antichrist, which should be the object of protest more determined than ever, affords the very motive or pretext for connivance. Few steps in the march of wickedness are now taken without requiring the sanction and consecration of the Church, whose ministers stand as the obsequious tools of pageantry, to do and undo as they are bid, to abuse every sacred rite and holy unction ; now canonizing freedom's martyrs, now proscribing her champions ; now blessing trees of liberty, now blessing their destroyers ; agitating, now for a republic, now for an autocrat ; now flattered by a speech, now driven with a whip ! Of all despotism that is the worst which professes to have religion for its ally. It were better that religion should suffer as its victim than prosper as its accomplice. And if

* See Note A, Appendix.

the cause of Christ is vilely traduced by being identified with revolution, it is still more seriously damaged by being identified with tyranny. Under the military despotism of these days, well compared to a hand bathed in blood which dips its finger into holy water, while a small minority of the priesthood, at first led astray like the rest, have been undeceived, the vast majority are prepared to light their censers in the worship of any new idol to which their homage may be required, and, in gilded servility, to keep *Te Deums* on hand for every job of that new Absalom, who bribes away the subjects and seduces the concubines of his father. How the Jesuits may end, we know not. At present, the mutual compliments of the rivals may be taken as the gauge of their mutual jealousy. Each is bent on first using, and then destroying the other. Whether the boy shall catch the crab, or the crab the boy, we shall not foretell.

Finally, it remains to be seen whether the head of the Romish Church, lacking the firmness of his predecessor under the First Empire, will, in his unbounded paternal benevolence, lend his submissive benison to an order of things established on the ruins of divine institutions. But, whether he do so or not, we have already proof sufficient how the fidelity of the Church has decayed since 1792, and how much fainter is the hope of her recovery to the path of rectitude and honour. Against this the present advances of the Papacy are no argument. We should form a false estimate indeed of the true prosperity of any Church did we take either her activity, her privileges, or her power as the standard of that degree in which she is either pleasing God or prepared for His kingdom.

It is a humiliating spectacle to see a great nation get "kicks as guarantees of good order." But we should not rest in mere indignation at this. It were more profitable to inquire why God has permitted it. And the answer is simple: "Because that nation has been the great advocate of the rights of man against God." Man has no absolute rights in his relation to God, as certainly as he has no tribunal where he can enforce them. To assert that he has, is nothing less than the denial or usurpation of Deity. The sole rights of man Godward lie in the good pleasure of God. Yet, through that good pleasure, he does acquire relative and derived rights. God does, in assigning to the creatures of His hand their proper places, thereby invest each man with rights as regards his fellow-creatures—rights to be enforced, either now, at human tribunals constituted by

God, or afterwards, at the great tribunal of Christ Himself. Of these rights, relative and derived, whether justly or unjustly apprehended and enforced, the constitution of the world is full. But, whatever blasphemy may have aforesaid lurked in the thoughts of individuals, or even in the published dreams of philosophers, the absolute rights of man, whether as those of a creature in regard to its creator, or as those of a being assuming, in its pride, an uncreated standing, were never propounded or accepted as an article of faith for the human race till the time of the first French Revolution. No soil could have grown such a plant but the ungrateful field of Christendom, watered by God, and watered in vain. The doctrine of Christ and that of Antichrist differ, not in this, that the former denies, while the latter avows, the rights of man; but herein, that the rights asserted by them are diametrically opposed, both in essence and in form, and therefore must conflict in exercise—the right of man to be and do what he pleases, with his right to be and do what God pleases. Yet the derived and contingent character of man's *true* rights makes them neither uncertain nor violable. They are eternally ascertained and secured by the will of God, however expressed, and by His power, however exercised. Whereas the false rights of man not only vary with his lusts, but shall be most violated by that which most loudly asserts and professes to vindicate them. A monarch, who himself had bitter experience of philosophy, is reported to have said that if he had a province to punish, he should appoint philosophers to govern it. Has not apostatizing Europe been justly punished in the person of France, by being given up into the hands of men who, while they doubt that God has constituted the things that are, have no doubt that man can reconstitute all? And, in the face of such daring persistence in piling humanity up to scale the walls of Heaven, what can be more righteous than the word, "Overturn, overturn, overturn, till He come whose *right* it is"?

Satan has often been described by the Fathers as the executioner of God's wrath on those who have despised and forfeited the blessings and shelter of His Church. But he is no less the ape of every work of God. Though he still retains his now perverted place and power, he is neither omniscient nor omnipotent. Although he knows that which he has wrought in man, he cannot search man's heart. Although from the beginning aware of, and envious against, the Divine purpose laid in man, yet, being excluded

by his fall from participation with the holy angels in those things which God shows unto them by the Church, he knows no more of God's counsels than his own craft and the unfaithfulness of men enable him to steal. And not only shall he himself be bound and thereafter eternally judged, but his works shall all be destroyed. In like manner, the wicked, though fallen, retain their original constitution. The Devil has created nothing new in them: he has merely perverted all. The desires which God has implanted in man are not in themselves sinful. It is, as James says, not till these desires conceive, by being fixed on wrong objects, that they bring forth sin. And by this is the fall of man proved, that all his desires are fixed on wrong objects, and thus generate evil. These his misdirected desires are the raw material on which Satan works. Because they are originally of God, it is Satan's delight to abuse them; because they are now diverted from God, he is able to do so. That future kingdom of Christ, of which the Church is now the mystery and contains the earnest, shall fulfil not merely a set of novel desires introduced into man with the Christian dispensation, but all man's desires, originally belonging to him as the chief of God's creatures, only elevated, ennobled, and rightly directed by Christian grace;—his ambition, his acquisitiveness, yea, his very anger. In like manner does the kingdom of Antichrist, by which Satan shall seek to anticipate and foreclose that of Christ, hold out, as a bait, the fulfilment of the very same desires, in their debased form and perverted direction arising from the fall of man. As God will satisfy the desires of them that fear Him, he who shall show himself that he is God must profess the same to his adherents. And forasmuch as the aspirations of the faithful shall become more intense and distinctly pronounced as the time approaches when those aspirations shall be realized, the very fact that such aspirations are inherent in man as a creature exposes them the more to perversion now than at any previous time. Does not daily observation confirm this view on every hand, whether among contents or malcontents, among those who seek to God, or those who would do without Him? There is, indeed, a numerous class whose fears make them shrink from that future in which the hopes of others are centred. But, whether men fear or hope, does not every year reduce the number of those who live on, in listless, euhemeristic optimism, in lazy satisfaction with the existing state of things? Even

the fears of men denote their expectation ; how much more so do their hopes ? Is not the world full of unquenchable longings ? Have not all men a conviction, however dark and vague, that a higher destiny awaits them ? Do they not feel and declare that they have rights and faculties not yet established or exercised ? Do they not claim a liberty and theatre of action which they have never yet had—how or where to be attained they know not ? Do not the village Hampdens refuse to die undeveloped ? Are not all men feeling the pinch of some undefined and multiform grievance, in commerce, in agriculture, in manufactures, in social and political relations, in physical pursuits and moral sciences, and, most of all, in religion, without knowing where to find the release ? Do not all, in ways most diverse, select some person or thing on which to fix the blame of this grievance, and some other person or thing for its remedy ? Are they not arising to emancipate themselves ? Are they not ready to follow any quack who brings a plausible *nostrum*, and to worship any one whose *nostrum* takes ? Although the majority of those now given to change are men of corrupted morals and selfish ambition, who, having neither reputation nor fortune to lose, promote all disturbance with the hope of gaining in the scramble, is there not a numerous class of persons whose sincere philanthropy and righteous indignation, coupled with ignorance of man's sin and God's holiness, with lack of faith and patience, have filled the ranks of revolution, in the hope of doing something to mitigate the travail and abate the oppression that are under the sun ? Both bad men and good are now waiting for something which, issuing from the womb of futurity, shall realize the words of the poet :

“Magnus ab integro sæclorum nascitur ordo,”

—the one looking for deified man, the other for incarnate God.

But wherein shall men really find the cure of these evils ? First of all, in knowing their cause. One should imagine that any who believe in God as the fountain, and in the ways of His appointment as the channel, of blessing, should arrive, by no long process of reasoning, at the conclusion that, as the forsaking of Him and the departure from His ways have induced the evil, a return to Him in the way of His unchangeable ordinances is the only effectual remedy. But what do we see ? For the few

who perceive the judgment of God on the sin of man and on the apostasy of the Church, we find multitudes who ascribe our present state to merely accidental circumstances, and many, alas! to the misgovernment of God Himself! Even they who do most distinctly see His hand are generally so ignorant of His counsels, that they have no right understanding either of the sin committed or of the deliverance to be expected. And the rest of the faithful, following their own fancies, their hereditary systems, or their popular guides, either struggle on without reference to supernatural aid, to any visitation from on high—or prostitute the name of Christ and the privilege of prayer, by invoking the blessing of God on means which He never appointed, and on projects which are at variance with His revealed will. Instance the Romish dream concerning the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, as the panacea for the moral disease of Christendom! Instance all the prescriptions of subjective and uninstructed religious quackery for the good of the patient. Instance all those confederate undertakings by which the godly at once betray their weakness and their fear, and in which, adopting the ways of the ungodly, they set aside, as unprofitable, the sacraments and ordinances of Christ, sow temporal things without reaping spiritual, and build their own houses while the House of the Lord lieth waste. On the other hand, the blasphemous thought that God is misgoverning the world, and that it must be taken out of His hand—a thought actually expressed by those consistent in daring—lurks yet unpronounced in the bosom of the multitude. The creature thinketh of its Maker: “He made me not—I am my own.” The thing fashioned of Him that fashioneth it: “He hath no understanding by which to perfect me—I shall perfect myself.” The crowning sin of Christendom, trained to the obedience of faith, but rejecting the training, is not its ignorance, but its disobedience. The sin which goes before to judgment, and invokes it, is not the love of sensual enjoyment, but the love of doing our own pleasure, after having known the good pleasure of God; not the mere ignorant breach of commandments, but the pride of self-sufficiency; the autonomous usurpation of Divinity, whether by a second Pentecost, by a second Incarnation, or by the gradual apotheosis of man’s powers, physical, intellectual, and moral; the effort of the human creator to finish *his* work, that he may look upon it and, pronouncing it very good, take his rest in the pride

of achievement. This is the true *αμαρτία*—the true missing of the mark; not the condition of primeval fall, but the wrong effort after future destiny. They who commit this, and not the ignorant heathen, are the true *ανομοι*, to be gathered under the *ανομος*—the king over the children of pride. Instead of believing and abiding in the Incarnate God, they believe and assert the divinity of manhood. The thoughts of their hearts shall be made manifest and their judgment sealed, by their getting from Satan exactly what they wish. They who have sown the wind must reap the whirlwind. The world now teems with false Christs, of whom men little wot. For, of all false Christs, they are the chief who propose to man the removal of the curse without mourning, confessing, and forsaking the sin for which man was cursed. As the activity of Satan increases with the shortness of his time, so does God make men feel the smart of the curse most when He is about to remove it. But He will never remove it, save in a way consistent with His holiness. It must be made plain that we have only reaped as we have sown, and that the curse causeless has not come. The cure must take its legitimate course, else it cannot be effected. If John preached the baptism of repentance to the Jews, there must be a still deeper penitence now. And the great day of atonement must precede the great day of redemption.

The warning that, were it possible, the very elect shall be deceived, implies that everything but the very mind of Christ shall find its tally in the coming delusion; that they only shall escape deception in whom Satan finds nothing on which he can work; and that the salvation of the elect (who shall certainly be saved) shall come through such perfection in holiness that they shall follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.

But Satan has not more to offer than God has. There is, as before said, no perverted desire of man to be satisfied in the kingdom of Antichrist which, if unperverted, would not find its satisfaction in the kingdom of Christ. In our present condition of antagonism and contradiction, we are surrounded on every hand with impossible problems, which no wit or effort of man can solve. Yet all men expect their solution. That expectation shall be realized. But herein is the mind that hath wisdom to reject the false solution, and accept the true.

And herein lies the difference between the two expectant attitudes of the faithful and the infidel—that, while the

former, in penitence, thankfulness, faith, patience, quietness, and humility, righteous in Christ, wait for the salvation of God, the latter, destitute of faith, impenitent, unthankful, impatient, unquiet, clamorous, with pride inflated, and in their own eyes pure—boasting that knowledge is power, and that power is right—will brook no delay in the remedy of evil, and in the fulfilment of their desires. The former, repenting of having tasted the one tree, wait to receive of Christ the other; the latter, having tasted the one, will force the gates of Paradise to grasp the other.

The deceiver promises to men the vindication of all their rights; the attainment of their proper place; the development of their inherent capacities; the perfection of their nature; the abolition of poverty, suffering, and crime; the harmony of social organization; the combination of perfect liberty with perfect order—of perfect equality with the reward of merit and exertion—of unimpaired personality with perfect unity—of the rights of property with community of goods—of domestic, social, and national distinctions with œcumenic catholicity—of the love of self with the love of mankind—of popular right with ambition—of the will of the anointing manhood with that of their anointed man. He promises them the perfect knowledge of the essence and uses of the creature—the perfect power to use it—the enthronement of man as its lord, not by gift, but by conquest—the banishment of all shams by eternal truth—the adjustment of all quarrels—the inauguration of universal peace—the turning of swords into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks—the restitution of Eden's blessing, of golden times, of Saturn's reign—the repeal of God's sentence in the curse—nay, the escape or conquest of death, and an eternal eudæmonism of life. All these things does he promise. All these he shall seem to perform; whether by tricks of so-called science, or by signs and wonders confessed. His kingdom were too palpable a lie could it not boast of success. God will permit it to do so, as a chief part of that strong delusion which He sends. Whatever sore judgments may, as the tokens of Heaven's unchanging wrath, precede, and whatever judgment to the uttermost shall cut short, the triumph of Antichrist,—we can have little doubt that the prosperity of the wicked, the apparent cure of every evil in the halcyon days of that terrible Utopia, will put the very seal of truth upon the lie. But the lie shall yet be exposed. That wicked one shall be man, and not God, in the hand of Him that slayeth him. By the

presence of the Lord shall he and his kingdom be abolished ; and on their ruins shall the Lord reveal that kingdom of His, in which all the problems of humanity shall find their eternal solutions, and all the desires of humanity, sanctified in the breasts of the faithful, their perfect fulfilment ; where peace shall be established—not the premature and godless fulfilment of Scripture by a Peace Society, but the rule of the Prince of Peace over a world cleansed of its lusts and rid of the wicked ; where a liberty shall be seen very different from that which is now the dread of Christendom, and a rule very different from that which is now its rod—the dignified obedience of those who are made free by the Son—the gracious rule of those who are under law to God ; where the alacrity of the meek shall be seen instead of the coercion of the proud ; where the true organization of the free, the true communism of a perfected body, shall be seen ; where there shall be a place for every person, and a person for every place ; where, instead of each demanding equality, that he may rise, each shall rejoice in the honour of the other, and all in the honour of their Head ; where the counsels of the Eternal shall supplant the empty thoughts of man, and the kingdoms shall become His kingdom ; where His unction shall lubricate the whole machinery of being, and His light dissipate every work of darkness ; where we shall know even as we are known ; where, delivered from the curse by Him that washed us from our sins, we shall minister His blessing, not our own ; where men shall bless themselves in the God of truth ; and where, instead of all being God, God shall be all in all.*

“ *Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*” Let us learn from our enemies before we abuse them. Let us be done with solemn unrealities and pious phrases, with pleasant songs to men, with worship *addressed to nobody*, with the trifling of this day’s religion. Let us awake to the true matter in hand. Let us borrow the clear vision, the fixed conclusion, the burning zeal, the indomitable perseverance, the reckless devotedness, the unshaken faith, the pregnant hope, the constant patience of the wicked. They are steadily proceeding through martyrdom to victory. They know what they will, and they will what they know. They are in earnest. They have a spirit within them. They shall attain their end, by the help of their God. They shall possess the world ; they shall possess it, although only to perish with it. But

* See Note B, Appendix.

while we emulate their intelligence and energy, let us beware of being seduced into their ranks. If we walk after the flesh, and, in such a mind, lust after spiritual things—if we invest natural blessings with a spiritual character, and so yield ourselves to prosecute them—or if, as spiritual as those who long for redemption and the consolation of Israel, as those who have opened their mouths that God may fill them, we, through simplicity, allow Satan and his angels, as angels of light, to give us a stone for bread, a serpent for a fish, or a scorpion for an egg—if we are seduced by toys from our holy education, and, gaping after curiosities, lose sight of the work and way set before us, we have forfeited preservation, and are in danger on every hand.

More especially are we in danger if we learn to regard increased discernment of the lie as either an indication of, or a substitute for, progress in the truth. We are not the holier that we delight in scanning with horror the lineaments of sin; neither are we the safer that we make the works of Satan our tea-table conversation. As the bird is fascinated by the snake, we may look at evil till we love it, and we may express our abhorrence at it till we abhor it no more.

In reviewing the moral condition of Christendom, we must be on our guard against attaching an undue importance to the events and evils of our own time, merely because they are the nearest to us. In every age of the world good men have recorded their grief over the sins of their time, as being without parallel, and have described them in terms well answering to the gloomiest views of any present moralist; and to look back with fond regret upon the past, as "*laudatores temporis acti*," instead of being incited for the future, is alike indolent and useless in those who see the sins of their time. Yet, if this dispensation is now ending in apostasy, there must be sure tokens by which to distinguish the present from any former state of things in the decadence of the world. The character of evil is often a surer test of our condition than its mere intensity. There are also sins the intensity of which can be estimated by those only who know their character. The amount of spiritual evil is not to be measured by either arithmetic or natural observation. The greatest of all sins—pride—inscrutable to mortal eye—may lurk under a hundred plies of outward humility, and, like the leprosy of old, assume the lustre and whiteness of blameless perfection. The dispassionate man of the world and the enlightened Christian are agreed in this, that the sins of our time distinguish it from

the past in as marked a manner as any of its other features do. And we have the express authority of Scripture for expecting to find a peculiar character in the sins of man at the time of the end—namely, that they have a striking similitude to true righteousness and actual approach to perfection; and that the essential difference lies in the sources from which the two kinds of righteousness proceed, and in the mode by which perfection is aimed at. The picture of men in the last days (those times so peculiarly perilous to the souls of men) with which the Apostle Paul supplies us, is verified to the letter in the eyes of all who will look deeper than the surface of things. If his first Epistle to Timothy has been regarded as indicating sins prominently seen in the Romish Church, his second Epistle has a far more undeniable application to the limbs of Antichrist. The catalogue of their sins, as of novel phenomena, begins with their selfishness, in denying God as the end of our being; proceeds to their lawlessness, in taking what pleases them, and not what pleases God, as the rule and aim of their conduct; and ends with their blasphemy, in denying Him to be the author of holiness, in being occupied with the manufacture of a godliness, which does proceed from God—with the establishment of man's righteousness—with the worship of humanity by man.* Paul warns us against such men, as being the seducers of those silly women (whether persons or religious bodies) whose growth is stayed, whose discernment is blunted, whose conscience is unclean, whose mind is fleshly. And he describes such men as the resisters of the truth; the deceived ring-leaders of the deceived, at the world's last crisis—the antitypes of Jannes and Jambres who resisted Moses, the type of our great coming Deliverer.

As to the religious condition of Christendom, it will hardly be denied that, if we had now to frame a creed or a liturgy, we should find it almost impossible to set forth therein that amount of truth which the creed and liturgies received from our fathers contain; and that, if we had now to determine the measure and manner in which Christianity shall influence the laws of nations and the customs of society, we should find equal difficulty in asserting for it the influence which it possessed in former times. Where is the cause of this to be sought? Let us throw out of account those errors in doctrine and discipline (the less ancient the more flagrant they are) which have been justly blamed, and those un-

* See Note C, Appendix.

warrantable usurpations by the priesthood, in politics and domestic life, which, although only the results of convulsive efforts to assert a true liberty and influence ever trodden down by the civil ruler, have been justly repressed.* And after we have done this, whether we take for our stand the written Scriptures, or the uniform testimony of the Church, we shall find that a large and most important class of things, now preserved by nothing but their traditional prestige from abolition, are things strictly accordant with scriptural truth and œcumenic doctrine; and that the breach of unity and laxity of principle, the true causes of their present unpopularity, are thereby proved to prevail at this time in a peculiar degree. Is not latitudinarianism on every subject connected with Divine government and human responsibility, the very boast of an age that glories in its shame? Is not all certainty of faith branded as presumption; all constancy of action, as intolerance; all jealousy for God, as hatred to man? Do any dare to say that they have the mind of Christ, as a thing distinct from mere obstinacy in their own opinion? Has not religion become a mere occupation of servants with outward business, a mere play of children around the outskirts of truth, instead of the service of full-grown sons, standing in the counsel of a Father, knowing whom they worship? Is not all verity washed out by that mawkish philanthropy which throws its fair disguise over hatred to God's requirements, and indifference to man's eternal welfare? Are not men's senses less and less exercised to distinguish good and evil? Are they not unable to pronounce with certainty upon anything? Are they not at the mercy of every deceiver? And do they not confess their unspiritual inability to discern, by ever seeking a sign to guide their decision? Where there still remains a sense for truth, and where practical issues, earthly or heavenly, are at stake, do we not see how the tendency of men to confederate is checked by the fear of bringing into contact latent elements of explosion, and of accelerating disintegration? Are not episcopal councils, at best, only parliaments without a king, composed of but one estate? Is not synodical action now the dread of all in authority, and of all who make for peace? Have not synods in modern times only increased the darkness which they were intended to dispel, and left the Church in the still worse condition of having tried to heal herself, and failed? Even where they have been tolerably unani-

* See Note D, Appendix.

mous, has not their internal agreement only rent the Church on a larger scale? Has the Romish Church ever ventured on a council since the days of Trent? Would it not now manufacture doctrines, if it did not mistrust the needful machinery? Have not the majority of its local synods been only the arenas of strife, or outlets for discontent and schism? While rival bodies, arrayed against each other, stand compact, are not all irenic efforts the mere elimination of everything worth contending for; efforts useless in proportion to their apparent success, and fruitful of self-delusion to all concerned in them? Do we not on every hand behold Churches prosecuting their objects by ignoring the very principles on which those objects are based? Does not the Papacy labour at the temple without a thought of bringing out the headstone thereof? And is not that unity of spirit, with diversity of form, which Protestants hold up against what they call the unspiritual uniformity of the Papacy, convicted of falsehood by their inability to see in the same light, or practically treat in the same way, the most radical questions? Must not two opposite views of Baptism lead to two opposite treatments of the baptized? Must not two opposite doctrines on the Eucharist lead to antagonist forms of worship—on orders, gifts, and ministries, to antagonist discipline—on the destiny of Christendom, to antagonist exertions?

The Apostle has truly said, "Come not wars and fightings of your lusts?" The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, although yet experienced by individuals, has been long unknown to the Catholic Church. The bond which holds each ecclesiastical body together is strongest where that body is most hostile to others. If "he that hateth his brother is a murderer," Churches which hate each other are the same. The Greek Church, most torn by heresy, sacrifices unity for orthodoxy; the Latin, most unjust in its claims, for terms of communion; the Protestants, most lax, for national limits, empty simplicity, arbitrary opinion, and private taste. Yet unity lies at the very root of the Church. It is absent if not visible.* And, without standing on the basis of unity, what hope is there for the acknowledgment of the truths which each body would vindicate? There is hardly a schism or heresy which has not originated in the exaggeration of truth at the expense of unity. If the well-being and right constitution of the Church are inseparable from her unity, the mere communion of a part, in so far as it

* See Note E, Appendix.

is exclusive, cannot be *her* communion in the *true* sense of the word, or make that part capable of the indivisible blessings intended for the whole. The Body of Christ men can divide, for it consists of men; but they cannot divide His Spirit. That Holy Spirit, true to Him that sent Him, can only be grieved and retire; taking with Him, into hiding, all perfect forms of sacraments, ministries, and gifts; and leaving their mutilated surrogates behind, to maintain the life, impaired, diseased, and perverted; while the body is moved (as in chorea) by other motive-powers than the will of the Head, and resembles the ruins of a habitation where the Divine inhabitant lingers in indignant silence. God forbid that we should undervalue the ordinances yet divine, the traditions yet sacred, the blessings yet heavenly, which the pity of God, by a miracle of grace, has still preserved to us; but every contemplation of that which still remains is searing to our conscience, if it blinds us to the extent, or lessens in our eyes the guilt, of our fall from that grace in which we once stood. If we rightly estimate the residue, we shall never rest till we recover the whole. Above all, we shall never call *isolation* Catholicity.

Looking at the present aspect of society, the picture is the same. If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle? The feebleness and uncertainty of the testimony given by the Church to God's unchangeable truth has dislocated and unhinged all society. If the Church is the Body of Christ, He should be known, in all her acts, as the doer of His Father's will; and if she is the salt of the earth, she should promulgate to, and by maternal care instil into, all her children those principles which each, on his own responsibility, should carry out in his own sphere, whether it be political, social, or domestic. But, as the prophet complains that, while the wild beast draws out the breast to its young, the daughter of his people has become cruel, so does the Church, like a step-mother, now see herself surrounded by a family who, through her neglect, despise the law, both of father and mother, and give their hearts to strangers. Pastoral care is now scouted as impolite, and spiritual discipline as inquisitorial tyranny. Spiritual censures are *bruta fulmina*, save where civil power gives point to priestly malice. And the just Judge sees our flagrant respect of persons. Are not the appliances of the Church, even where most superstitiously retained, only endured, without assignable reason, as a necessary evil and acknowledged sham? Are not the feasts

of the Church either obsolete, or the seasons of levity and debauchery? Are not the fasts alike obsolete—fasts without fasting—substitutions of luxuries for food; or burdens which nothing but ready dispensation or self-righteous penance renders tolerable? Has not the sacred acknowledgment of Christ's Lordship and Priesthood, by the payment of tithe, degenerated into a mere strife of covetousness in claiming and withholding, estimated as a mere tax on property, and commuted into secular allowances? Is not the cure of souls sought as a lucrative profession? Is not the goodness of a "living" its money value—the well-living of the incumbent? Is not charity taken out of the hands of Christ's ministers, divorced from the law of love, and administered, in no contact with its objects, with no sacrifice of self? Is not marriage, the focus of all social blessing, divested of its Christian sanction and halo; on one hand the passport to licentiousness, on the other the sport of arbitrary dissolution? Are not the obedience of children, the fidelity of domestics, the watchful and merciful protection of employers, the loyalty of subjects, the patriotism of kings, consigned to the place of old wives' fables? Does not family prayer decay? Is not any slackening in the incessant tear and wear of the human machine, for the sake of man's eternal welfare, an interruption not to be suffered, save as it may make the machine more serviceable? Does not the naming of Jesus—the acknowledgment of God—the appeal to His power, His fidelity, His mercy, His judgment-seat—disappear from our public acts and monuments, from our business transactions, from our daily intercourse? Where, but in English universities (which God will honour for the deed), is secular education based upon faith, and hallowed by prayer? Are not all schemes for education substitutes of instruction for discipline, of knowledge for godliness; shattered on the Scylla of conflicting creeds, or engulfed in the Charybdis of infidel neutrality? Is it not by some unblushingly proposed, and by others most feebly refused, to admit those who count the Lord of Glory a blasphemous impostor, and who, if consistent, should scorn the boon, as joint counsellors of a Christian ruler in governing a Christian people? And, save where the State, jealous in the maintenance of power, and fearing treason under the cloak of religion, maintains its connection with the Church for the sake of influence and espionage, is it not the whole tendency of modern policy to divorce the State from the Church, not that the Church may

prosper, but that the State may be no more reminded of God? In public and in private, the polite devil has banished the vulgar one. The outside of the platter is cleansed, but within it is filthier than ever.

Such is our religious and social condition. Judgment begins at the House of God. And where lies the remedy?

The representative of the house of Bourbon and of divine right has publicly declared, as a true patriot should, that he will not embroil his country by a hopeless struggle, and that he will not claim or accept the throne of France until, by a revolution of national sentiment, his divine right is generally and sincerely recognized. In this we see not only a noble assertion of true principle, but an example by which self-constituted reformers of the Church would do well to take warning. But the hope of seeing such ideas realized must, alas! be postponed to the Greek Kalends. Kings by divine right, holding their crowns, not, as Romanists affirm, by the grace of the Pope or of the Church, but by the providential appointment of God, and the acceptance of nations standing in the faith of God's disposal, are the true witnesses that Jesus is King, and the true precursors of His kingdom. And, already possessing their power by a title anterior to and independent of ecclesiastical rites, they receive anointing in the Church, as a confession of their position, and for supply of grace in their duties, as ministers of Christ. But every such testimony during the Christian dispensation has its limits and termination. Kings have no ministry, priestly or diaconal, *in* the Church. Through their succession to the place of the Roman Emperor, and the unfaithfulness of the clergy in not avowing the true character of the Church, Christian kings have been brought into the danger of wedding the Church to themselves, as Abimelech was with the wife of Abraham. Yet the Church can never *flourish* under even an universal empire, and can never be *one* under the rule of *many* kings. And although we do read that the kings of the earth shall bring their glory and honour into the New Jerusalem in the dispensation to come, we read nothing concerning them at the close of the present, save that they shall seek to be hidden from the wrath of the Lamb, and that some who bear the name, being carried away by the universal delusion, shall, under the dominion of Antichrist, assume a new phase and occupy a new position—rejecting the Lordship of Christ, receiving power as kings one hour with the beast, and exercising that power to the destruction of the harlot Church, to the maintenance

of Antichristian tyranny as expressing the popular will, and to the fulfilment of God's word concerning the judgment which He will execute. As no part of Christian truth can be abolished, and as the Church, in her progress to perfection, will assert that truth with increasing distinctness and fulness, we have reason to expect that the great doctrine of the divine right of kings shall never lack its assertion until He come who is the King. But we have equal reason to fear that, as Antichrist shall take away the daily sacrifice and obliterate the ordinances of the Church, he shall, in like manner, while served by kings of his own, put an end to that glorious testimony which kingly rule in a Christian form bears to the Kingship of Christ; and that any king who magnifies in his own office the sacred office of Christ, may do it to the forfeiture of his throne—perhaps even at the price of martyrdom.

If any king will now stand for his divine right, God be with him. But let him search his motives, count the cost, and well weigh his acts. If he will feed his pride, pamper his luxury, and justify his oppression; if he will take his ease and let go the reins; if he will, in person or by proxy, wring his pleasure from the pain, and plant his power on the necks of his people; if he will refuse to consign into the right hands that government of the Church which, till they appeared, he has rightly held; if he suffer his magistrates to impede the progress of the Church to perfection; or if he dream of fighting his battle without the help of Christ's Church,—he cannot stand. But if, knowing whose minister he is, he will learn of Him who, being Lord, was yet the servant of all; if he will be a man of constant prayer and self-denial, and arise from his knees to wield the sceptre within his proper limits and according to the counsel of those who fear God,—then shall the Lord assuredly stand by his right hand. And though the hosts of hell combine against him, as the bearer of that name which they hate and dread, they shall not prevail.

But there are others who hope great things for the Church from the liberty afforded to her by modern liberality. Some expect that the Roman Catholic Church shall step in, between impotent Protestantism and vacillating Monarchy, to re-establish society and bear up the pillars of the earth. And they would secure for her the popular favour by a strange *non sequitur*—that because she has always thriven best under liberty, she is therefore its friend. This idea is so far important, that it betrays an instinctive perception that no

existing agency is equal to the necessities of the time, and that any adequate agency must be ecclesiastical. But farther value it does not possess. For, while the Romanist expects that *tertium quid* which shall save us to be the See of Rome, every other sectary will expect the same for the sect which he thinks the best. So many translations can be made of one text. At the same time, there can be no doubt that everything, good or evil, thrives where it has free scope; and that every one naturally takes that side on which he supposes his interests to lie. The proclamation of universal licence as a thing absolutely right, must take away the many existing hindrances presented by intolerance to the development of the ways of God, and must afford an opportunity to His servants which they should thankfully accept, and can successfully employ, until new and worse hindrances arise in the jealousy of infidelity against the power of emancipated truth. Indeed, in the present condition of European policy, both national and international, no man who knows what the Church of God should be, and what is requisite to its progress, can see any hope for the accomplishment of God's purposes and the liberation of His captive children, save by some great convulsion, which, *without any interference on the part of the prisoners*, shall shatter to pieces their prison-house, as by the *act of God*. But it must ever be remembered that, although the same event may give enlargement to the truth and to the lie, and although, by the undiscerning, the innocent captive and the dangerous criminal may be classed under the one category of those who long for liberty, the two are as diametrically opposed as ever, and will so clearly show their opposite characters by their acts when liberated, as to meet with the most opposite treatment at the hands of men and God. David was among the Philistines, shared in their triumphs, and was regarded as a Philistine by Saul; but he was still Saul's reverent friend and Israel's future king. Christ and Barabbas both needed liberation. But Christ was imprisoned for righteousness; Barabbas for crime. Christ was brought out to be crucified; Barabbas escaped. Revolution intends no liberty for godliness; but, emancipating everything, it cannot consistently retain the truth in prison, although it will soon provide a fresh prison for it. Meantime all classes of men expect from revolution the fulfilment of their various desires. The infidel expects the abolition of the name of Christ; the ambitious churchman, the suppression of sects; the sectary, a fair field and

no favour, in order that the Aaron's rod of each party may commend itself by its fruitfulness. And he who, standing steadfast in the faith of God's covenant and counsel, loves the whole of the baptized as brethren, and seeks their common and eternal good, may also expect liberty of action for a season. But, though revolution gives liberty of action, no Christian man may stir it to obtain that liberty. And although infidel indifference may permit the publication of truth, it is a soil in which no truth can grow. The faith and patience of the saints is the right school of truth—the hearts of the contrite its proper soil—they who love it its proper advocates. God has no fellowship with the wicked. He will not have them to take up His name into their lips. His hand of judgment is in the efforts of destroyers; but His hand of grace is not. Where, then, is His hand of grace? Surely the Church needs something more than mere liberty to act. Can any man, not spell-bound by a system, so confound the *infallibility* which the Church should possess by abiding in Christ, with her actual *infallency*? Can he believe that, because she should and need never have erred, therefore she has never done so; that she has been always fully competent to regenerate society; that all her failure has been from outward opposition; and that, so soon as that is removed, all shall be well? No: the disease is in the physician as well as in the patient. And the grace of God must be seen not only in giving liberty to act, but in restoring the agent to health and efficiency. "Physician, heal thyself." Mutual recriminations, such as those of Protestants and Papists, are worse than idle; as much so as if the sick in an hospital were to reproach each other with their diseases, or as if each were to imagine himself whole because exempt from the disease of the other. The disease, in diverse forms, pervades the whole body; the remedy must apply to the whole; and it must come from the head of the whole. It is the mere work of the accuser to exult in the exposure of evil; but it is the way of God to commend the remedy by making the evil felt. And they are the only true physicians who both know the disease and are provided with the remedy. We cannot doubt that, when the convulsions of Christendom give free scope to every kind of agency, God, by whose providence these convulsions come, has a saving agency prepared, which shall improve the occasion thus afforded to the hastening of His kingdom. As the Jews were commanded to seek the peace of Babylon while captive there, and as all who acted otherwise perished, so are we bound to

be loyal towards the ordinances of the Church, although her condition is one of confusion and captivity. All premature attempts at deliverance, all efforts to separate the wheat from the tares before the harvest, have signally failed. But when Babylon is broken up, when the harvest approaches, our work must change with the change in God's dealings. And it is the sacred duty of every Christian to see that he improves the occasion to the full, by religiously abstaining from efforts originating in man, and by thankfully recognizing and heartily embracing that which originates with God. Thus only can we hasten His kingdom. Of such an agency we have now to speak.

Out of the heart are the issues of life. The family is the health of the State; the man is that of the family; and the man is sanctified in the Church. *This is God's way of reform—His door of hope.* The Church is the soul of Christendom—the fountain of its life; and those only benefit the one who find out the true disease and the true remedy of the other. As the Church herself is either the saviour or the corrupter of society, so are the ordinances of God either a blessing or a curse to her, according as they are administered and received in the Spirit or in the flesh. Hence, whatever tribulation from without the Church may innocently suffer, her inward decay is always a suicidal work. Like the descent of the children of Israel into Egypt, that position into which, on the conversion of the Roman Empire to the faith, the Church soon descended, in taking rank as the second institution of this world—one sustained by human wisdom, sheltered by human favour, and devoted to human objects—may have kept her from greater evils, nay, even preserved her existence. As Pharaoh found Joseph useful, and Joseph saved his father's house, so has the civil power, feeling the value of the Church, done much to preserve the life of God among men through ecclesiastical agency. But that false position of the Church defeated the hope of her appearing in her true character. The embrace of the world is fraught with danger to the life of God. The schisms, the heresies, the superstitions, the blandishments and the cruelties of the Church are but the individual and variable phenomena of a universal and abiding evil condition, in which nothing but the judicially blind can assert that she is at all prepared to meet the Lord. But it serves no purpose to raise a crusade against error, unless we set corresponding truth in its place. The corruptions of truth are profitably abolished, not by mere negation, but by carrying up into

a higher and purer form the truths corrupted. And if we ask how this is to be attained, it is idle to point our view to this or that local remedy, this or that surface cure, this or that promising scheme. It is no doubt the sacred duty of each succeeding generation, and of each man in his place, to do our utmost for the remedy of evil and the furtherance of good, according to the measure of the light and opportunity vouchsafed to us; but it is quite a different and much deeper question, how Christ, who has been the Head of the whole Body in all ages, and is so yet in all places, will now take up His people as one body, and lead them on to perfection. The question is not, what shall men best undertake, but what will God now do?

To this question our first answers must be negative. We shall be helped to discern how Christ will save us by clearly seeing how He will *not* do it. In the first place, then, He will not do it from without; for this simple reason, that He is not without. As God, He filleth all things; as Son of Man, He is Head over all things to His Church, and can make all things contribute to her well-being. But, as Saviour of His Body, He dwells in His Body; as the fountain of grace, He is found in the Church; and His Spirit, as the channel from the fountain, has the Church for His special abode—for His Temple. Hence they are utterly at fault who expect renovation of the Church from any extraneous quarter,—be it the favour of kings, the laws of nations, the counsel of the wise or the wealth of the rich, the patronage of the great or the votes of the multitude. Kings, nations, wise men, rich men, great men, multitudes, may be individually members of the body of Christ; but their offices in the world are not offices in the Church; and none can renovate the Church save those who are commissioned to minister the Holy Spirit in her. In the next place, Christ, as abiding in the Church, will help her only by His own ordinances, by those declared to be His in Holy Scripture. Therefore no ordinances substituted by man for His can ever perfect the Church. Thirdly: His ordinances must be used in those mutual relations in which they were set by God at the first. Therefore no exaggerated or defective, transposed or confused ordinances, such as Papal supremacy, independent Episcopate, councils of mere bishops, isolated pastorship, or vagrant preaching, can do the work. Fourthly: These ordinances must not only be agreeable to Scripture in their form and relations, but they must be actually constituted and empowered by Christ; they

must flow from Him, and be filled by Him, as their living Head, through His calling and ordination. Therefore, no ordinances fabricated by men, without Divine authority, at their own will, in imitation of Divine ordinances, although they outwardly answer in every part to the divine pattern, can restore the Church. These are a mere pious forgery. Fifthly : As the perfection of the Church must proceed from her perfect Head, so must her unity from His unity.* Therefore no mere wishes, efforts, contrivances, or compacts of the separate parts of the Church can really and organically unite them together. All proposals for Christian unity, and schemes for its realization, are indeed to be welcomed, as evidences of a right desire after union, and even as a preparation for it ; but they are utterly powerless to effect it ; and, if pertinaciously preferred to God's way, they positively hinder it. No new shuffle of the cards can repair our fortunes ; no better arrangement of the prison-house can liberate the captives. Man can rend Christ's Body, but he cannot bind it up. The recent attempts of some Churches, in a condition bordering on dissolution, to retrieve their affairs by the sudden revival of obsolete discipline among a people utterly lacking that faith, love, and intelligence on which all true discipline must be based, are *preposterous*, in the literal sense of the word. Such Churches only expose themselves to the derision of scornful Romanists ; and they are very likely to direct their first acts of discipline, in suicidal blindness, against those who bring to them the help of God from Heaven, because it will fit into no religious formula known to their narrow systems. But of all folly that is the greatest which expects the reform of the Church from popular assemblies, or imagines that an apostate people can take the initiative in seeking God. He must seek us first ; He must lay His hand upon us to make us one again. Health-giving unity cannot be restored, save by a bond of unity proceeding from and provided by the Head of the Church, in the form of those ordinances which are essentially constituted by Him with commission and power to embrace the whole. Sixthly : When God visits His people, He will neither approve one part of the Church, and condemn the rest, nor perfect one part, and leave the rest behind. He will acknowledge the good and reveal the evil in each, and will carry forward the faithful of each part to perfection, in communion with all the rest. Hence the hopes of Romanists,

* Note F, Appendix.

that the Church shall be saved by all being brought back into the Romish communion (in which they never all were), and the hopes of the Protestants, that the Church shall be saved by mere emancipation from Romish error and priestcraft, are equally vain. A Church which dares say, "I am so blameless that all who follow God must take my name," is on the highway to the judgment of Capernaum, blots out the name of Christ to inscribe her own, and exhibits God as the mere partisan of favourites. And that which may be good and right for one portion of the Church would be quite misplaced if made law for the whole. Seventhly: No ordinance but that which is commissioned to minister the Spirit of Christ to the whole body, not to mere separate parts, can bring the Church, as the Body of Christ, to be also His fulness. Lastly: No ordinance but that which, by being "neither of man nor by man," but by God and Christ, keeps the Church in the unity of her risen Head, can prepare her for that kingdom to which we are called in one body, and can present her as a chaste spouse unto the Bridegroom. To none but to them that look for Him shall He come the second time without sin unto salvation.

These, then, are ways in which the Lord will *not* save His people. But dare we, therefore, conclude that He will not save them at all? Shall the work be impossible to Him because it transcends the invention or comprehension of man? On the contrary, we read that, while eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man the things that God hath prepared for them that love Him, they *are revealed* to the saints by that Holy Spirit who searcheth the deep things of God. And if, in considering the days of old, and comparing the true standing and vocation of the Church with her present state, we are led to cry out with David, "Will the Lord cast off for ever? and will he be favourable no more? Is his mercy clean gone for ever? Doth his promise fail for evermore? Hath God forgotten to be gracious? Hath he in anger shut up his tender mercies?" we have also the answer of God to us, as to him: "This is *our* infirmity. We will remember the years of the *right hand* of the Most High;" of that God who is in His sanctuary; of that God who doeth wonders; before whom the waters are afraid; before whose voice the earth trembleth; whose footsteps are not known; yet who leadeth his people like a flock. (Psalm lxxvii.)

We must now, therefore, give the positive answer to this great question by showing what God will do, and has begun.

"When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him." "And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and to them that turn from transgression in Jacob." That standard is the Church—Apostolic as He who is sent—holy as He who is of God—Catholic as He who is Head of all—one in His unity—furnished and adorned with His anointing—He in her, and she in Him. This standard no arm of man can raise. We have destroyed, but we cannot help ourselves. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord." We may cry to our idols to save us; but the Word saith, "Be silent, all flesh; for the Lord is raised up out of his holy habitation." Before the first coming of the Lord, flesh had done its best, ere He should, by walking in the Spirit, blow upon it. And the present time, in religion as in politics, abounds with men of mongrel parentage, like the giants of the flood—great to look at, weak in fact. Many sons has the Church borne, but none of them can help her. The Lord now gives her those who can. "The children are come to the birth, but there is not strength to bring forth." The Lord now gives the strength.

He, whose throne is the heaven and His footstool the earth, looketh to the contrite. He, whose hand is not shortened, nor His ear heavy, will bring salvation to the penitent. They who keep the fast which He hath chosen, shall build the old waste places, raise up the ancient foundations, repair the breach, and restore the paths to dwell in. Though our mother has sinned, she is not divorced. Though He seem to have cast us off for ever; though His anger smoke against the sheep of His pasture; though his enemies roar in His congregation, and setting up their ensigns for signs, break down His carved work, cast fire into His sanctuary, defile His dwelling-place, utter blasphemy, and consult destruction; though we see not our signs, have not a prophet, and know not how long; though the constitution of the Church is as if dissolved in death, and her life as if in the place of the departed—the Lord will not deliver the soul of His turtle-dove unto the multitude of the wicked. He will have respect unto His covenant; He will plead His own cause; He will pluck His right hand out of His bosom. And though the vision of all has become as a sealed book, which the unlearned cannot read, and of which the learned cannot break the seal, He shall cause the deaf to hear it, and the blind to see it. The mystery of God shall be finished.

This God has begun to do. He has looked down from

the height of His sanctuary ; He has arisen, to have mercy upon Zion. The set time to favour her has come. The prayers of the destitute, the groans of the prisoners, in every generation and in every province of the Church, have come into His ears ; and He has brought forth the answer. He has found servants who take pleasure in the stones of Zion, and favour the dust thereof ; who recognize the unity, the privileges, and the responsibilities of all the baptized ; who regard them all with His eye, as the materials for the restoration of His ruined sanctuary. He has brought these His servants, by much discipline, into that attitude in which they can rightly apprehend and employ the enlarged measure of His grace. He has inspired them with faith in His continual presence and guidance, and with hope in His promises. He has endowed them with discernment and charity, by which to guard them against that which is of man, and to open their hearts for all that is of God. He has made them the brethren of all, and saved them from being the partisans of any. He has bound them, by no dead though consistent theory, but by the circulation of a common life, with all the baptized, and taught them to reverence all ancient ordinances, and accept, with thankful recognition, every good thing existing ; so that every section of the Church shall find its excellencies embodied, and its blessings, like the manna of old, equalized in them. They have not started up as innovators—railed, as accusers—striven, as rivals—or rent themselves off, as schismatics ; but, with the piety of children towards a mother, and standing in the communion of the one body, they have received an increase of grace, as His boon to them in common with the whole, and have been taught to exhibit his fuller ordinances and purer worship, as a pattern which the whole should follow with thankfulness and joy. They have no new Baptism, Bible, or Gospel ; they have no separate root ; they are no strange graft, intruded to fester ; they are a green branch out of the one ancient root. Though unavoidably worshipping in separate congregations, because the service of God and the exhibition of His ways require a theatre for corporate action, their position is that of the truest Catholicity. Nay, they are, strictly speaking, the only Catholics. First, because they recognize the sacrament of Baptism as the *sole basis* of communion ; second, because they set up no *terms* of communion exclusive of any baptized man ; third, because they receive Apostles as that divine ordinance which, set over the whole body, is Catholic in the only true sense. Their

work is not that of division and destruction, but that of binding and building up; the work of restoring all things, as the Baptist did; the sacred enforcement of every duty, the honouring of every relation. Among them have the gifts of the Holy Ghost, ever present in the Church from the beginning, but elsewhere quenched through unbelief, or perverted through sin and inexperience, been not only revived, but rightly regulated, and, instead of usurping rule, been applied, under wise rule, to the edifying of the Church. Among them has the Christian priesthood—enfeebled, as in Eli, defiled, as in Hophni and Phinehas (1 Sam. ii.)—been restored to its dignity, as in Samuel, and developed in its various provinces and proportions. Among them has the Christian ministry been brought out from confusion into its true partition and efficacy. Among them has the Episcopate found its bond of unity and head of strength in Apostles, not erratic wonder-workers, but the chosen elders of the Angel of the covenant, ministers of His spirit, and bearers of His rule. Among them does the ministry of prophets, evangelists, and pastors co-operate with that of Apostles. Among them does the counsel of the brethren* sustain the authority, inform the judgment, and facilitate the action of Apostles, so that the Church may attain to that infallible guidance which she should have, not through usurped theoretic infallibility, but by each, in his place, having the mind of Christ. Among them is the integrity of each Church and nation harmonized with the unity and uniform guidance of the Universal Church, and the dignity of every redeemed man with the government of Jesus as the Son of Man. Among them, not at a new altar, but at the ancient altar, repaired, as by Elijah of old, for all the tribes of Israel (1 Kings xviii. 30), is God duly approached with holy worship, in the way appointed by Himself. Among them is the memorial of Christ's sacrifice continually presented before God. Among them are tithes voluntarily paid to Him that liveth. Among them, builded on the ancient foundations, is the ancient faith preserved, developed,† and declared. Among them does the Holy Ghost, conforming to the ordinances of Christ, cast His bright light on the inspired canon, bind the law and the testimony in one, give the key to the enigma of events as they arise, and, manifesting Himself in diverse gifts, fill the hearts of the faithful with comfort. Among them does

* Note G, Appendix.

† Note H, Appendix.

each Church, as a city, find the watchman in its angel; the sheep of Christ a shepherd in the pastor; His brethren a brother in the deacon; His members a member in every other, and strength to fulfil all their duties in the State, in society, and in the family. Among them do the faithful receive, through the laying on of Apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost, as the seal of baptism, the armour for conflict, the pledge of salvation, the first-fruits of the inheritance. Serving the living and true God, with no carnal rule or obedience, sanctions, weapons, or devices, they wait for His Son from Heaven.

In Britain did this work begin; yet not for Britain's merit or Britain's solitary good. God chose, for the reviving of His heavenly gifts, for the calling forth of His Apostles, for the ordering of His house, that land in which the three great distinct forms of religion, the Romish, the Episcopal, and the Presbyterian—the monarchical, the aristocratic, and the democratic—find themselves represented; that land in which, while sobriety and reverence for law guard against extravagance, constitutional liberty permits freedom of action; the only land in which the working of God's Spirit to restore the Church might not have been at once checked by priestly intolerance or regulations of police; the only land in which such congregations of the faithful could then have been gathered, and could have enjoyed unfettered action. In that land has God appointed a centre of operation whence His servants shall go forth, and a pattern which they shall follow, while labouring in every part of His heritage. And to these His servants has He given the sacred commission, to be the peacemakers of Christendom—to labour for the maintenance of loyalty and order, of justice and mercy—to meddle with the affairs of none, whether in the State or in the family, but to strengthen all in doing their duty to God and man—to warn all against their dangers—to encourage all in the promises of God—to save what will be saved from apostasy—to gather the scattered sheep into the fold and the profaned vessels into the sanctuary—to minister the Spirit to the members of Christ—to build up His people in faith, truth, hope, and love—to present every man perfect in Him—and thus to find a bride worthy of the Lamb,—in fine, to witness of His session on high, and prepare the way for His return. In their hands the true Aaron's rod shall at last be seen to have budded. Their letter of commendation, the true seal of Apostleship, shall be holy churches. Their

reward shall come at His appearing, before whom wood, hay, and stubble shall burn—before whom gold, silver, and jewels shall stand.

By this work, which, as a flying roll, shall pass, with the measures of the true sanctuary, throughout Christendom, God now puts Churches and nations upon their trial: Churches, whether they will accept the proffered perfection; nations, whether they will favour its attainment. The future of both depends on their deportment towards this mercy of God. If they accept it, they shall not be led into temptation, and shall be delivered from evil. They shall be saved from delusion and judgment; they shall be counted worthy to escape the things that are coming. God will be a wall of fire around them, and the glory in the midst. They shall stand before the Son of Man. But if they reject it—if they be of those who decree unrighteous decrees, and fortify their gates against the grace and truth of God, the Father of the fatherless and the Judge of the widows, they shall know what it is to have done so. They shall be left helpless and defenceless, by the departure of the glory, as before it visited them. *Yet not as before.* They shall have incurred the additional guilt of rejecting the greatest and final help of God, the most marvellous proof of His enduring mercy. Israel of old, having refused to enter the land, on the report of the faithful spies, and having thereby evoked the irreversible sentence of God against them, repenting too late, resolved in vain to “go up into the place which the Lord had promised;” and, the Lord being no more among them, when they presumed to attempt it, they were smitten before the enemies whom they had else discomfited. (Exod. xvi.) Thus shall these Christians, also disobedient to God’s proffered grace, fall before those foes whom all who improve it shall vanquish. The ominous motto, “Too late!” shall be theirs. They shall not know; they shall walk on in darkness (Ps. lxxxii. 5); and as the mockers of Elisha were torn by the she-bears (2 Kings ii.), so shall they reap the condign punishment of their guilt in the delusion and the oppression of Antichrist.

The absolute, either in form or in degree, ignores the necessary adaptation of truth to the infirmity of man. God does not require of the palsied, diseased, disjointed body, that it shall at once receive all the food, or perform all the functions, of health. But while He patiently bears its condition, and tenderly administers to it that which it can bear, His treatment of it aims at nothing less than its perfect

health, wherein "being fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working of the measure of every part, it may grow up in all things into Him which is the Head, and from Him make increase, to the edifying of itself in love." To this end has God visited His people again, giving to the daughter of Zion her judges as at the first, and her counsellors as at the beginning. Through Apostles and prophets does the Lord seek to heal Babylon; not by adding one more to the number of her streets, and to the elements of her confusion, but by bringing order out of confusion, health out of sickness, life out of death, faith out of uncertainty, hope out of despair, charity out of selfishness; by reducing us to the obedience of Christ, and restoring the Church to be really His fulness. And when they, and all who receive them as the Urim and Thummim of God, are taken up and preserved in the secret of His Tabernacle, God shall judge on Babylon their judgment. Oh, that the ministers in the Church, from the Pope to the acolyte, did know the time of her visitation; lest one stone of her be not left upon another; lest even the wall of Rome, compact to the eye, but daubed with untempered mortar, and already disintegrate, come down, wall and daubers, in a moment! Oh, that the rulers in the State knew their true source of guidance and fountain of help, lest they "perish with the uncircumcised," or survive to "give their power to the beast!"* The nations are now restless like the waves of the sea. Their troubles demand remedy—their lusts novelty. And the demand shall evoke the supply. To the deceived, the rule of Antichrist shall furnish the one, and his signs the other: for the "day of the Lord is darkness" to all save the children of the light. But the faithful shall be holpen of the true God. For Him they shall not wait in vain. As in the days of Noah, of Sodom, of besieged Jerusalem, God shall have a refuge for His people, not, as then, on earth, but in the cloud of glory with their returning Lord. And as, at Leipzig's battle of nations, Greek, Roman, and Protestant united to break the rod which had smitten Christendom, so shall the remnant, out of every tribe of God's spiritual Israel, *made one by Christ, as He and the Father are One*, stand up as a host, and turn to flight, with far other than earthly weapons, the armies of the aliens. In our days shall the word be spoken and done. Shall railway trains career through the earth, and the mission of the Lord

* Note I, Appendix.

be tardy? Shall telegraphs strike the pulse of instant sympathy at the antipodes, and the mystery of God not be finished at once in all parts of His heritage? Yea, "He will make a short work." "For the elect's sake he will shorten it." The lion of Judah shall deliver the prey. We shall not only have His blessing, but *share His throne*.

God works to the sense among heathens, but He works to faith in the Church. And His work of healing must be small in its beginnings. Let us beware how we despise the day of small things, through lack of spiritual discernment and fleshly lusting after signs. God has expressly warned us against the danger of so doing, by that prophet who did the analogous work of helping to rebuild the temple of old. (Zech. iv. 10.) And let us be no less on our guard, lest we incur the curse of those who, from any motive, refuse to come to the help of the Lord against the mighty. God will indeed judge the secrets of men, but He will judge according to their deeds. Christendom is now on its trial; its acts towards God will determine the verdict. He would help the nations by His Church, and He will judge them by their conduct to His Church. They that touch her touch the apple of His eye. Whatever is done unto her, He counts done unto Him. Those shall now be forsaken who will not be helped; those shall now be judged who *do* that which calls judgment down, whose "sins are open beforehand, going before." God's enemies shall be known by their blasphemy against His tabernacle and them that dwell therein; His friends, by their honouring the one, by their cherishing the other. If we are to be saved from judgment, our "good works must be manifest beforehand." (1 Tim. v. 24.)

Hear what the sure word of prophecy saith concerning the end of Christendom: "Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly [the grace of the Spirit], and rejoice in Rezin and Remaliah's son, now therefore the Lord bringeth upon them the waters of the river, strong and mighty, even the King of Assyria [Antichrist] and all his glory: and he shall come up over all his channels, and go over all his banks. And he shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over; he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land [Christendom], O Immanuel" (Isaiah viii. 6).

But hear also what it saith concerning the end of Antichrist: "Behold, the name of the Lord cometh from far, burning with his anger, and the burden thereof is heavy: his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue is a devour-

ing fire. And his breath, as an overflowing stream, shall reach to the midst of the neck, to sift the nations with the sieve of vanity : and there shall be a bridle in the jaws of the people, causing them to err. Ye shall have a song, as in the night when a holy solemnity is kept ; and gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the mighty One of Israel. And the Lord shall cause his glorious voice to be heard, and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hailstones. For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian [Antichrist] be beaten down, which smote [or, "he shall be smitten"] with a rod. And in every place where the grounded staff [or, "uplifted rod"] shall pass [or "fall"] which the Lord shall lay upon him, it shall be with tabrets and harps : and in battles of shaking will he fight with it [or him]. For Tophet is ordained of old ; yea, for the king it is prepared ; he hath made it deep and large : the pile thereof is fire and much wood ; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it." (Isaiah xxx. 27.)

And hear the word to the faithful : "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the *world*, to try them that dwell upon the *earth*."

"I saw them that had gotten the victory over the beast, and over his image, and over his mark, and over the number of his name."

If we suffer with Him, we shall also *reign* with Him.

"YE ARE OF GOD, LITTLE CHILDREN, AND HAVE OVERCOME THEM ; BECAUSE GREATER IS HE THAT IS IN YOU THAN HE THAT IS IN THE WORLD" (1 John iv. 4).

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

The following is an apposite quotation from a work lately published in Germany:—

“Power from beneath is the rising sun to which all men do homage. Monarchs humble themselves before their dreaded rival. The mighty of this world quail before his threatenings. The ambitious and selfish observe his growth. The voice of conscience is silent in his presence. Priests sacrifice at his altar. Rome herself plays her last desperate game in ministering to him. And the emancipated Jew, in whom the hope of his fathers has died out, stands ready for anything by which he can make advantage, and waits, with apostate Christians, to hail the last Antichrist as his Messiah.”

NOTE B.

Not only does the future kingdom of Christ hold out true answers to the true demands of man, but the Church, as the mystery of that kingdom, affords them in measure, as an earnest, now. The great truth at the bottom of Socialism is this: that the spectacle of one human being rolling in luxury, while another is pinched by penury and ground down by toil, is contrary to the will of God and the duty of man. The remedies proposed by Socialism must end in the ruin of both rich and poor; but there is a true remedy, and that is to be found where God has ordained it—namely, in the ordinances of the Church, and nowhere else. The State has no right to effect by law the daily or yearly equalization of property, labour, and enjoyment. Nor, were this lawful, could it be accomplished. But as, under Moses of old, he that gathered much had nothing over, and he that gathered little had no lack (Exod. xvi. 18), and as, under Paul, the abundance of some was a supply for the want of others, and that of others for theirs, that there might be equality (2 Cor. viii. 14), so should, in the Church of God,

the machinery of love, among those who are members one of another, effect an equalization of property which shall redound to the good of man and the glory of God;—as it is written, “It is more blessed to give than to receive;” and again, “The administration of this service not only supplieth the wants of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God.” The ministry of deacons is, among baptized men, the only one which, as exercised in the discernment of Christ, secures, on the one hand, a proper outlet for the beneficence of the rich, and, on the other, a wise, loving, adequate, and economical supply, and a proper guard against oppression, for the poor. By it alone can the left hand be kept from knowing what the right doeth; the giver preserved from ostentation, partiality, and exaction; and the receiver from cringing, hypocrisy, and discontent.

NOTE C.

It is remarkable that the two greatest heresies of the Primitive Church, the Arian and the Nestorian, both tended, under the subtle form of a righteousness *derived from God*, to remove from the eyes of men the righteousness of *God Himself*, as become man, and as the only fountain or example of righteousness. And the heathen estimate of such things as unimportant questions, is like the Christian estimate of their importance now. Surely it is no matter of moonshine whether man shall perfect himself or be perfected of God. The issues of Christendom may hang upon a word, as with *filiolique*; nay, as with *ομοουσιος*, on a letter.

NOTE D.

The following remarks on the relations of Church and State may be here not out of place:—

On the first introduction of Christianity into the world, the heathen rulers of the earth stood in no acknowledged relation to the Church. On the conversion of Constantine, the civil ruler, acknowledging the Church as a heavenly institution, began to apply its divine offices to the blessing of his Christian subjects. And at the end of the Christian dispensation, civil rulers, apostatizing from the faith, will nevertheless seek to retain the instrumentality of the Church, as an earthly system suited to sustain their power; and will thus become her snare.

The Church first appeared in the world, ruled by those

appointed of God, as a body independent of the State, and as the mystery of a heavenly kingdom; yet every member of the same was bound, like other men, by allegiance to the State in all matters pertaining to this world. Through her failure to wait for Christ, she lost the full instrumentality for the exercise of His heavenly rule over her. She left room for the introduction of earthly rule. The unity of the Roman Empire favoured the intrusion of the emperor into the place of ecclesiastical rule. As visible and universal head in one category—the earthly, he was already prepared to appear as the visible and universal head in another—the heavenly. No civil ruler of a mere fragment of Christendom could have claimed any such place. None but an œcumenic authority could embrace an œcumenic institution. The conscience of the Church testified for the necessity of her being under a visible and universal rule; while her unbelief had forfeited its true expression and ecclesiastical element in Apostles. Therefore, the Bishops at Nicæa invited the Emperor, not only unordained but unbaptized, to take the presidency; and he, on his death-bed, expressed his desire to be ranked as *ισαποστολος*, in virtue of his care in governing the Church of God. From that time the ruler and the priest sought to make tools of each other, as Nestorius said to Theodosius, “Rid me of heretics, and I will rid you of the Persians.”

The Roman Empire, having thus swallowed up and subjugated the Church, underwent the judgment of God, in its partition among many conquerors, and in the rise of many nations on its ruins. The true universal, *i.e.* the ecclesiastical, rule over the Church having long since vanished, this subsequent disappearance of that universal civil rule which had become its substitute, removed the only remaining symbol of unity from the Church. This would have led straightway to ecclesiastical schism as the inevitable consequence of national partition, had not the Papacy arisen within the Church itself (not as a counterpoise to the power of the emperor, but as a counterpoise to that of those separate kings who had supplanted him), and thus rescued from perfect oblivion the unity of the Church, although by the unscriptural exaggeration of a local into an œcumenic primacy. Thenceforth continued the sad and multiform contest between ecclesiastical schism nationally engendered, and ecclesiastical unity maintained by usurpation; until, at the Reformation, the indignation of honest men—not against the universality of ecclesiastical government (although in an

unscriptural form), but against the unrighteousness in which, partly from the mode of its origin, partly from the sin of priests and people, it was exercised—burst forth, with a demand for reform, in rejecting which the Papacy as really incurred the guilt of Protestant schism as subsequent Protestants, by their conduct, have incurred that of Papal obstinacy in error. The Protestants, cut off by the Pope, voluntarily erected no new schismatic institutions, but, in desiring shelter, only took shelter under many civil rulers for want of a better; just as the whole Church, for want of Apostles, had formerly courted the shadow of Constantine.

The Pope and the King have each been, in different points of view, a blessing and an evil to the Church. Nothing could be more natural to those who had lost the distinction between earthly and heavenly things, than the idea that the king, as sole and unquestioned governor of his subjects, should guide their best, that is, their religious affairs; and that, as head of all corporations in his dominions, he should superintend the most important of all corporations, the churches in his realm. And equally natural was the opposite idea, that, as the Church is the fountain of all blessing to men, she should also be the director of their civil affairs. As to the latter of these two errors, it is needless to do more than allude to the salient points of Papal usurpation: the power of binding and loosing given to Peter, beyond that of remission and retention given to all the Twelve; the bridegroom seen in the Pope, his friends in other priests; the power of the Pope to dispose of men at his will (Jer. i. 10), and to alter or abrogate the law of God, on cause shown; the requirement of subjection to the Pope as necessary to salvation; the doctrine that two swords, one temporal, and one spiritual, had been given to Peter (Luke xxii. 38), of which he has, by his followers, handed over one to emperors and kings, as his mere ministers, and retained the other for the Pope; the alleged transference of power from the head to the shoulders when kings are anointed by the Pope—he ruling over the Church, as the sun, they over the State, as the moon; the claim of the Pope to depose all kings where due cause is shown, and to absolve all subjects from allegiance to heretics. These may suffice to illustrate the evil. And the evil itself has been long and loudly protested against. But the intrusion of the civil ruler has done equal harm. The authority, thus misapplied, is in itself a legitimate power. While it has so greatly transgressed its spiritual limits, it has not transgressed its territorial; and the obtuseness of spi-

ritual perception in the Church causes its evil working to be unobserved and unfelt; nay, the chief outcry against it has been by those priests whose unlawful projects it has thwarted. Nevertheless, it is the most effectual, because the most legitimate and unsuspected, instrument of schism and decay; and, till it be removed, the Church can never be perfected. It matters not whether the King propose for the Pope's adoption, or the Pope submit for the King's sanction; whether the King govern the churches by laymen, or employ churchmen to govern them in his name;—the evil is the same. A king may worship with his people, nay, he may enjoin them to worship; he may use his power to shield the truth against its enemies; but he cannot legitimately either conduct or dictate the worship of the Church, prescribe to her in matters of faith, direct her discipline, control the ecclesiastical acts of the priest, or persecute for conscience' sake.

Under the rule of the Papacy—not to speak of the attitude of the Gallican Church—both the concordats of the Pope and the pragmatic sanctions of the King testify, over all Europe, not to the exercise of two harmonious functions, but to the compromise of conflicting interests—not to the existence of true unity, but to the bond of unscriptural Catholicity—not to the due recognition of national diversity in the one Church, but to a predominance of regal will over the churches, for which occasional acts of regal prostration before ecclesiastical power do not compensate. At one time the rulers of the Church have sacrificed truth to keep supremacy; at another they have sacrificed that supremacy for gain. Of the Eastern Church, we see one portion still under the heathen, and therefore the most inwardly free; but a second is seen in Greece, nominally under the Patriarch of Constantinople, yet really under a bureaucracy similar to that of most Protestant Churches; and a third, in Russia, has been expressly cut off, not from heretics, but from the other orthodox Greeks, for the purpose of being put, as an exclusively national institution, under the Holy Synod—a branch of political administration to which the honour of patriarchate, forfeited, in Greek estimation, by the Pope of Rome, has been transferred. Among all existing national Protestant Churches, whatever be the form of administration—episcopal, territorial, or collegial—*i.e.*, prelatie, magistratic, or popular; whether the King claims original right, as lord of the soil and all upon it, καὶ ὑπερέχον; or whether he professes to take up the for-

feited Papal episcopacy; whether he hires clergy as his servants, or appoints others over them; whether he arranges all things in worship and discipline himself, or commits it to his clergy to do so,—in all cases alike, the clergy are *his*. He is the fountain of their commission, and the judge of their acts; he is the head of the Church. And it is thereby prevented from being anything more than national. In England, the Oaths of Abjuration and Supremacy, while they unmeaningly abstain from asserting for the king the headship of the Church in that sense in which it is denied to all men, positively assert it for him in that sense in which Apostles had and should have it, and in that form by which Apostles are excluded. They deny to any foreign prelate (*i.e.*, not foreign to the Church, but to the land) any ecclesiastical jurisdiction or authority in Great Britain; and they make the consent of the king indispensable to councils at home, and to the presence of any English prelate or priest in them abroad. The name of the king stands, as first, before those of bishops and priests, in the prayers of the Church; and, whatever be the autonomy, practical or theoretical, of Anglican bishops, the initiative in their appointment is taken by the Crown. Hence the Anglican Church dares not receive Apostles, unless they *are* Englishmen, *confine* their labours to the Anglican Church, and *obey* Parliament in their spiritual work—*i.e.*, unless an unlawful and schismatic element be infused into their divine office, as intrusted by the Lord with the care of the whole Christian Church, and unless they have no liberty to deliberate in council, or to act according to what the Lord may teach them. Indeed, Usher admits that, whenever the Pope substantiates his claim to be of the Apostolic class, the Oath of Abjuration must be altered. And, lastly, in Scotland—where the Church, though national, appears, in the mode of convening and conducting its councils, and in many other things, to be free from State interference, and where she certainly intended, during her struggles, to make herself entirely so—late events have proved, and a careful examination of her position would at any time have shown, that she shared, in a more latent form, that subjugation to the State which is the inevitable dealing of God towards all Churches that pretend, as being national, to a Catholicity which, as being national and *no more*, they deny. No doubt, in the details of worship and administration she is unfettered; but her doctrine and constitution she holds by virtue of Act of Parliament; she dares not amend or enlarge them; and the late testimony raised in

her against patronage has hit a real blot in her constitution. For, although patronage does not affect the rights of the Church to supply the class from whom the patron shall make his selection—whether he be regarded as an individual, or as the depositary (hereditary or otherwise) of a common right devolved by the congregation upon him—it is contrary to the way of God, and a snare to the Church. The *initiative*, whether in ordination or in mission, should not lie with the laity, let their acceptance and consent be held as essential as they ought. And there is another element of civil subjugation, more important, if possible, than patronage, which the Scottish Church has overlooked, in common with most Reformed Churches, and which the Church of England, long an exception, has also recently admitted, in its latter part, without protest—*i.e.*, the enforcement of tithe by law, and its recent commutation for a secular provision, whether that provision be paid by Government, by the parish, or by the laity. The tithe is the Lord's; it never was, or is, man's. It is reserved of God; and He gives it to His priests for His altar's sake. It is the only fund on earth on which man has no claim, for which he cannot compete, which is the correlative of a heavenly priesthood, which cannot be paid, unless by faith, as an act of worship to God, and which should be paid by all classes, that all may be blessed of Him in return. Tithe enforced by law is a debt of this world, and no earnest of the expected kingdom. Tithe supplanted by any other provision, though a larger one, is the heavenly supplanted by the earthly, even when paid by the same persons. How much more, then, when paid by a few or by a class? And it matters not, whether the clergy are paid by Government, or by their flocks, by subscription or assessment, if the institution of tithe be disowned. Lay patronage, and a fifth part of the heritor's rental, secured by Act of Parliament, and recoverable at law, are hooks sufficient to entangle the Church in the affairs of this world, and their acceptance is provocation enough to bring down judgment corresponding to the sin.

The supremacy or intrusion of the civil power in the Church affects her in all things. First: In her government; for she cannot receive Apostles, or any ministry wider than her national limits. Many nations may have similar religious institutions, but those institutions, though like, are not parts of one whole. Their uniformity effects no unity. The discipline of a national church, subject to the civil ruler, may work much that is good, but can never be more than a

seeing to the well-being of the particular kingdom ; not an education of the Church, as such, for the kingdom of God. Secondly : In her deliberations. Bishops from all Churches merely national cannot constitute true œcumenical councils. These cannot have presidents entitled to preside, for they have none with such jurisdiction over all as the Apostles had in the Council at Jerusalem, or even such as the emperor had, although his jurisdiction was civil, not ecclesiastical. They cannot be constituted by sole ecclesiastical direction ; they cannot meet or deliberate independently. Their decrees issue from men having no catholic jurisdiction, and cannot be carried out unless taken up and adopted by each king. Thirdly : In her worship. The worship of the Church is not impeded in ascending, through the appointed channels of ministry, to God ; but it must be so if it ascend through a civil governor. None should govern the Church through whom her worship cannot ascend to God. Fourthly : In her blessing. A king may wish the Church well, but he cannot minister the Holy Ghost ; a bishop may minister the Holy Ghost, but only in so far as his ministry is not from a king ; in so far as it is derived from a king, he cannot. A king can bless his subjects, but not the Church. He has a larger capacity to receive blessing from the Church than private individuals have, for he has to distribute it to more ; but he has no power to bless in the Church, especially none to bless priests. And clergy blessed by kings, not by Apostles, go without ecclesiastical blessing in its proper sense ; they get a mere well-wishing instead. Fifthly : In her provision. Tithe is the reserved portion of the Lord. State provisions come not out of it. God is not worshipped in the paying or the receiving of them. The priesthood is denied, and the funds of the nation are perverted, by any substitute for tithe. Lastly : In her discipline. Spiritual censures are efficacious according to the faith of the Church. Where there is faith, their power is seen. The Church will seek no other weapons, and will appeal to the day of judgment. But where faith decays, she undervalues her own power, and her children despise it. Herself in Satan's hands, she can no longer deliver to Satan. Hence, that her censures may not be *bruta fulmina*, she delivers to the sword instead, publishing her own weakness. And where the State rules in the Church, the latter can more easily invite, and the former render the service of executioner, than if the Church were free.

It is the sending of Apostles to Christendom that will

deliver the Church at once from the schism produced by the operation of the civil power, and from the spiritual usurpation committed by prelates in contending against that schism.

NOTE E.

The true character of unity in faith and rites is illustrated not only by that of the human body, and that of the prismatic colours, but also by the unity of music. Monotonous uniformity can never truly and fully exhibit unity. There are many instruments which each can use, and many notes which he can play. There is variety in the succession of melody; there is variety in the concert of harmony. Such variety, so far from disturbing, constitutes the unity of the piece. But there are notes which can neither succeed each other, nor be struck together without discord. These are at irreconcilable variance with unity. Perfect harmony and melody are symbols of spiritual identity under many contemporary forms and successive phases of exhibition. The more multiform they, the more glorious the unity. But discord is the symbol of spiritual diversity in the successive history or contemporaneous exhibition of the Church. The more multiform, the more grievous the contradiction. And we may as well attempt to make discordant notes parts of one piece by juxtaposition on one paper, as persuade ourselves that contradictory doctrines or acts are ecclesiastical unity under diversity of form.

NOTE F.

In a recent work on the practicability of communion between the Greek and the Anglican Churches (a thing sought by those Protestants who retain the instinct of Catholicity, but despair of Rome), the following passage strikingly exhibits both the possibility of an Apostolic, and therefore œcumenic, Church government (transcending either national and diocesan limits or synodical powers) and the heavy responsibility of rejecting the same: "If there is any such thing as the visible Church of Christ, as one Catholic and Apostolic Church throughout the world, any particular, national, provincial, or diocesan church, which either refuses on principle to be bound by any more general legislation than its own, or, in practice, after having admitted that legislation, flies off, neglects, and contemns it, is, *ipso facto*, breaking with the Universal Church, is dissolv-

ing its communion, and renouncing its adherence to the constitution given to her on the day of Pentecost." The same author gives, as the first condition of unity, "men, already prepared, in whom the Church and her hierarchy are contained," who shall lead to "the ark preparing, and to the true Zoar."

NOTE G.

The council held by the Apostles at Jerusalem is the true model of a general council and of the machinery for Christ's infallible guidance. In some respects no subsequent council could have followed this model; in others all subsequent councils have voluntarily departed from it. In that council we see the Apostles, not the mere spokesmen of a legislative body, but the sole rulers of, and legislators for, the whole Church—the elders, or bishops and priests, as their assessors and counsellors—and the brethren (*i.e.*, the Christian people) either personally present, or represented by their deacons, as those whose wants, wishes, and spiritual sense, whose intelligent assent, were to be expressed and obtained; in short, the king, helped by the counsel of his peers and the voice of his people, to rule with wisdom, justice, and mercy. But in all subsequent councils the proper rulers of, and legislators for, the Church Catholic have been absent. The counsellors, of whom each at best had a rule derived from Apostles and limited to his own diocese, usurped by combination, or gave to a temporal sovereign, the vacant place of oecumenic rule and legislation. Bishops appeared alone, to the exclusion of priests, deacons, and people. And although the Church has virtually confessed the inadequacy of her councils by acknowledging no canons as oecumenic which have not been passed by bishops from all parts, or subsequently universally received, the slightest knowledge of the way in which the attendance of bishops and the consent of the faithful were obtained, should convince us how very differently a true representation of the Christian people at the time would have worked. (Acts xv.)

NOTE H.

By the development of the truth is to be understood neither the Romish nor the infidel development, but that of which the dealings of God with man till Christ came, the method of our Lord's teaching while on earth, and His actings, personally or through His ministers, since His re-

surrection, afford the true examples. The Romish Church, which boasts itself unchangeable, has changed more than any, and has justified her changes under the name of development. But, while the Church, in her proper organization, is the right instrument of God for developing His truth, all so-called development wrought by her is not necessarily His. Now, that development is certainly both false in principle and ruinous in its effects, in which the Church, pleading the authority of God, forsakes His landmarks in its exercise. Her duty to observe the latter is as sacred as her right to plead the former; and all progress in which she either dispenses with or perverts the norm of Holy Scripture, all doctrines and rites not contained in or plainly derivable from Scripture, are false. On the other hand, the infidelity of this day, the successor and destroyer of effete Rationalism, claims to be but a new development of truth—either Christian truth deliquescent through modern civilization (*i.e.*, indifference and scepticism), or abstract truth casting off the narrow slough of transitory and now antiquated Christianity, to expand into its true and eternal form, and bring in the new era of the world. Let us beware how, in our longing for true development, we follow this subtle delusion. Let us hold by first principles. One God, eternal, omnipotent, apart from, before, and above nature. One Son of God, equal with the Father, become very man for ever, Jesus Christ, come in the flesh, raised from the dead, and coming as He went. One Holy Spirit, equal with the Father and the Son, not the spirit of man, not the spirit of nature, not the influence of God, but very God, dwelling in the Church. One Bible, inspired of God. One Church, constituted by one Baptism, fed by one Supper, expecting Christ's glory. *No truth but in Christ, the way, the truth, the life.* No spirit true which is not in the Church, and does not confess Jesus Christ come in the flesh. No perfecting in the flesh what was begun in the Spirit. No perfecting save by men. No ministry save by mission. No declaration of truth save in accordance with inspired Scripture. No success save by striving according to law. No progress by disowning the past. Christianity no mere phase of truth—no pious myth; and infidel innovation no new phase of Christianity. Lastly: no hope for the world but in the return of JESUS OF NAZARETH. The dealings of the unchangeable God alter with circumstances, and His purposes are developed with the times. But let us steer by the old compass and the old chart, refusing every spirit, word,

or letter of bastard origin, as *ignes fatui*, and holding no parley with the old liar, though he wear the new garb of inductive philosophy or mesmeric revelation. "Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines."

NOTE I.

He that will successfully plead divine right as his safeguard, must have acknowledged it in others. The right of kings has no fountain more divine than that of nobles, people, parents, children, husbands, wives, masters, and servants—each class in the place appointed to it by God. The kings of corporate Christendom have been corporately judged. They have fallen before revolution, not because God could or would not uphold them, but because they had disregarded those divine rights of others which they had been set to preserve as sacredly as their own. And, in the days of vengeance, the sins of the fathers are visited on the often innocuous children. Neither have priests any peculiar plea which shall keep them scathless for their attempts to obtain the obedience of cyphers, instead of moulding redeemed men after Christ—for their obstinate disregard of the protest made, secretly or openly, by all classes, from the throne to the cottage, against their crimes, and for their success in making the name of priest and the offices of the Church so stink in the nostrils of honest men, that they would rather be infidels than bear the offence any longer. Revolution and scepticism are not the only objects of God's displeasure. Let those who would mercilessly hunt disturbers and free-thinkers off the face of the globe, instead of setting them a good example, see to it that they do not yet need an asylum, and forfeit it.

As early as the twelfth century, a Russian metropolitan furnished to a Russian prince a meditation and a rule of duty, in the form of a paraphrase of the 101st Psalm, which is not unworthy to be stored up in the memory of all modern princes. And the living writer who has lately brought this document to public notice, concludes with the following words his conscience-stirring sketch of a hierarchy self-degraded to the service of men, instead of fulfilling a work of counsel and mediation which no layman can: "For such a hierarchy—to advise and correct their sovereign in his political government; to support the throne in times of weakness and trouble; to defend the cause of the poor; to maintain the balance between the conflicting tendencies of outward

authority and outward licence; to prevent, by the admixture of a spiritual element, and the presence of a spiritual check, absolute monarchy from becoming despotism or tyranny obedience and loyalty from becoming vicious and slavish subservience, and reasonable and religious liberty from passing into a cloak of licentiousness—these offices would be manifestly impossible.”—*Palmer's Dissertations*, p. 91, 92. Masters. 1853.

APOSTLES GIVEN, LOST, AND
RESTORED.

1853.

APOSTLES GIVEN, LOST, AND RESTORED.

THE Lord Jesus Christ is the Head of the Church, not only as the ruler of her actions, but as the source of her being ; and that, not as He was on earth, but as He now is, on the right hand of power. As the apostle, He ministers to her the Holy Ghost ; as the prophet, He reveals to her the things hidden in God ; as the evangelist, He preaches to her the kingdom of Heaven ; as the pastor and teacher, He builds her up in holiness ; and as Lord, He governs her.

How does He perform all this ? Mediate or immediately ? and, if the former, by what mediation ? He does not descend from Heaven, neither do we hear His voice or see His action from Heaven. He operates mediate, and the mediation is that of the Holy Ghost, sent by Him from the Father, sent by the Father in His name, who is on earth, who personally dwells in the Church.

But how does the Holy Ghost thus mediate ? He is now not merely the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus. Yet, while the Son is incarnate for ever, the Holy Ghost has not become incarnate ; He has not assumed any created nature, although He is subordinated to the Son who has. And if He is to exhibit an operation conformed to creature conditions, it must be by dwelling in creatures, and acting by them, in a mode accordant with their creature constitution. This He does in and through those baptized into Christ. As Christ's action is mediated through Him, so is His action exhibited in theirs. This exhibition is twofold, because the relation of the baptized to Christ is twofold. We are subject to Christ, and we have also fellowship with Him. In the one relation, yielding to Christ, we are impelled by the Holy Ghost ; in the other, as those who have fellowship with Christ, we are entrusted with the ministry of the Holy Ghost as a divine and sacred gift.

All admit, on the one hand, that we are called to serve Christ ; on the other, that none save He can bless His Church. But the question is, whether any are called to serve Him in imparting His blessing to others, or whether He reserves that office to Himself ; in other words, whether the Christian ministry, in its origin and operation, is divine or human ? If Christ fulfils no ministry to the Church by men, then the Christian ministry has no divine basis, and exercises no divine power, but is a mere pious fraud. But if it is admitted that in any one way Christ does minister, or at any one time has ministered, to men by men, such an admission takes for granted that a ministry from Christ by men is possible, and is according to the will of God ; and if it is possible and has occurred, then its lawfulness at least, at all times and in all ways, is conceded. There is, then, a Christian ministry in the Church, divine in origin and operation ; and it is lawful to expect through it the blessing of Christ, in all its completeness, in every one of its forms, and at all times.

Every body of Christians claiming to be a branch of the Church has acknowledged, expressly or tacitly, the office of the preacher and pastor ; and, instead of denying its divine character, men have been rather disposed too hastily to admit that character. But why they should limit the character to that office, and deny even its possibility to any other, is not easy to explain, unless by the mere fact that, generally speaking, no other exists. Such a limitation is utterly destitute of warrant from Holy Scripture, and it can only rest on one or other of the following grounds : either that Christ has no other office, or that He communicates no other, or that He did so only for a temporary object, or that He has substituted new and innominate offices for those once designated and communicated, or that He has adopted offices invented and instituted by men. But the burden of proof lies on those who frame these theories ; and that proof cannot be legitimately drawn from existing circumstances. The very question at issue is, whether these circumstances are according to the will of God or not. It must, if valid, be drawn from Holy Scripture and the analogy of God's counsels and dealings towards men.

That all the offices by which Christ blesses His Church are communicable to men, we know from the fact that they have been communicated. That, when communicated, they were intended to abide, is clear from the facts that Christ

still exercises them, and that their object is not yet attained. That their place cannot be supplied by other *divine* offices is plain, because they are His offices. His offices alone are divine, and they cannot change, unless both He and the Church change; which is impossible in fact, and nowhere hinted at in Holy Scripture. That He cannot adopt offices invented by men is equally plain, unless He is to execute the counsels of man. And not less plain is it that none of His offices are now needless; for, if so, either He would never have had them, or we must be in a different dispensation from that of primitive Christianity.

Taking for granted, then, that the offices of Christ are abiding and communicable, we find that one of these offices is the Apostolic. We use the word in its strictest sense. We mean neither apostles of the Churches, men sent out by religious bodies on special missions, as in 2 Cor. viii. 23, and perhaps Phil. ii. 25; nor mighty preachers of the Word, either among the heathen or in Christendom, whose labours have been crowned with signal success; nor wise dignitaries, whose schemes and labours have signally benefited the Catholic Church; nor men distinguished by primitive simplicity, sanctity, or miraculous powers. We mean Apostles such as Paul, neither of men nor by man, but by Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead. As the Holy Ghost Himself, although quenched, grieved and blasphemed, still remains in the Church, so have all the ministries of Christ, although forgotten, unknown, despised, abridged, exaggerated, and perverted, still exhibited themselves as they could. Every age and region of the Church has had and exhibited the remnants or the buddings of Apostleship; yet it is undeniable that for nearly 1,800 years no men have appeared with just, still less with admitted, pretensions to the name of Apostle, as indicating a distinct office. Such is the fact. But the question remains—should it have been so, and should it be so now? That which is permitted of God is not therefore His will. The measure of Christ's blessing corresponds to the behaviour of His Church. If the Jews always resisted the Holy Ghost, how much more does the whole history of the Church convict her of the same sin in its most aggravated form! Wherein has she not frustrated the grace of God? And if such be the case, how can the condition into which she has been brought and in which she is found, by hindering God to work, be taken as the expression of His will? As well might we say that baptized men should commit sin, because they do so;

or that, because Judas was a devil, the Lord intended to choose one.

God now puts theories to silence by His own mighty acts. He has arisen. The arm of the Lord has awaked. He would send His Son from Heaven; He would prepare the Church for His return; and to that end He is giving again Apostles and all other ministries which flow from theirs. In order, then, to understand His will, to recognize His work, and to receive His salvation, let us reverently investigate—

1. The Nature of Apostleship.
2. Its Permanency.
3. Its Constitution.
4. Its Decay.
5. Its Restoration.
6. Its Credentials.

I.—NATURE OF OFFICE.

I. When we speak of Apostleship we do not speak of all that men called to be Apostles have done, but of that special work which the Lord Jesus Christ committed to Apostles after His ascension, after He Himself had entered on His Apostolic functions in the heavenly Jerusalem. Although the Lord was while on earth the chosen of the Father, and had in Him the rudiments of every office which He should afterwards fulfil, He *then* did no more than the work *then* entrusted to Him, by which the way was prepared for His being made perfect through resurrection and ascension (Heb. v. 9); in other words, for His full qualification as our Saviour. Part of that preparatory work, of which His atoning death on the cross formed the centre and climax, was the choice and education of His Apostles, both before His death and after His resurrection. But they could not enter on their office as Apostles until the great Apostle in Heaven should send them. Their previous life, after being chosen by the Lord, was their training for office. The true nature of that office must be sought for after our Lord's ascension, and, even then, not in the things which they did in common with others, but in those which they alone could do.

1. They are the beginning of the Church—not in point of time, for some believed before them, and 120 were together at Pentecost; nor merely by being the first to gather the members of the body through preaching,—but in

point of constitution. As God saw them in Christ, so did Christ see the Church in them. And that fellowship with the Father and the Son in which all Christians stand, is one in which Apostles take precedence, and which they admit the Church to share with them. (1 John i.) No doubt the whole Church is Apostolic—sent into the world by Christ, as He by the Father. Save for this, the office of Apostle would have neither meaning nor end. But the question is, not whether the whole Church is Apostolic or not, but how she becomes so. The Apostleship of the Church is no more prior in order to that of Apostles than their's is to that of the Lord. As they derive their's from Him, so does the Church her's from them. It was the Twelve who received the commandment not to depart from Jerusalem, the assurance that the ascended Lord should come again, and the commission to be witnesses unto Him. And although all the disciples waited and prayed and received the Holy Ghost, it was the prayer and waiting of the Twelve, the descent of the Spirit upon them, and their testimony to Christ, which fulfilled the command, the promise, and the mission.

2. Apostles are the witnesses to Christ's resurrection and ascension. This is not the attestation of a barren fact that He is no longer to be found on earth, or that He disappeared in the sky; nor is it a proof submitted to the judgment of man's intellect. It is the testimony to Christ's session at the right hand of the Majesty on high; and that testimony Apostles give by receiving power from on high, by a practical answer to the question, where Jesus now is. Because this testimony was to be given by the Twelve, Peter said to the disciples that one must be chosen from among those who had known the Lord during all His public ministry on earth, to be a witness with the Eleven to His resurrection. Many others had known the Lord, many others could attest the fact, many others received power from on high in the Apostles' fellowship; but the testimony required was that of the Twelve; and that testimony was given by their receiving power from on high.

3. Apostles are the dispensers of the Holy Ghost to the baptized. On the day of Pentecost, before God had turned to the Gentiles, Peter in his first sermon promised the Holy Ghost to every one who should repent and be baptized—*i.e.*, to every one who should become a member of that mystical body, the glorified Head of which was anointed not only above, but for His fellows. The preparation for this gift was

not left to arbitrary grace ; it was to be obtained according to a fixed order, whether by Jew or by Gentile, whether by those near or those afar off—namely, through holy baptism. We may not doubt that they who received the word of Peter and were baptized, did thereupon receive the Holy Ghost. If they stood in the Apostles' *fellowship*, they surely did so in regard to the best thing which the Apostles possessed as a thing common to the Church—namely, the gift of the Holy Ghost, as the seal of that doctrine, and as the strength of that worship, in which they continued with the Apostles. And they are clearly to be reckoned with those of whom we read shortly after, that they were filled with the Holy Ghost. (Acts ii. 4.)

But if baptism was the appointed introduction to the gift of the Holy Ghost, was there no further divine appointment as to the mode of its bestowal ? Was the rest left to arbitrary grace, to invisible divine agency ? Had God begun, and was He to proceed with, the ordering of His House and the appointment of distinct channels of grace ; and was the greatest act of His grace to be performed in total disregard of all order and ministry ? Was the Church, in regard to the reception of the Holy Ghost, to be a mere unorganized commonwealth ? Were all the joints and bands by which the Spirit should act to be fixed by God ; and was the bestowal of that Spirit Himself to be left without all regulation ? It could not be. When we inquire how the baptized were to receive the gift promised to them, the answer is evident, that if God gives baptism by men's hands, He will give the Holy Ghost also by men's hands. Both are divine acts—acts of Almighty power. If the Holy Ghost hath condescended to be sent by a man, and that man, as man, is like unto us, why may not that man minister Him to men by men ? If we must receive the Spirit without intervention of man, why not also baptism ? But baptism is appointed to come through man. And if so, if we are to be brought through man's hands into that position in which alone we can receive the Holy Ghost, are we to receive the gift itself without intervention of man ? If so, why wait for baptism ? Why make an *immediate* act of God to depend on a *mediate* act, on the will of man ? Why control the will of God, who gives the Spirit, by the will of the minister, who baptizes ? To all this the Scriptures furnish a plain answer ; and that in three ways—by historical narrative, by implication, and by doctrinal statement.

The very next occasion on which we read of the gift of

the Holy Ghost occurred at the time when the Gospel, although not yet taken from the Jews, had been forced by persecution from Jerusalem into Samaria. Philip the deacon preached there and baptized those who believed. On hearing of this, the Apostles sent from Jerusalem two of their number, Peter and John. And for what purpose? Not merely to mark the progress of the faith, or farther to instruct the believers, but to pray that they might receive the Holy Ghost. What made them immediately think of this? Because they remembered the promise given by God, through Peter, on the day of Pentecost, because they knew that that promise had been fulfilled, because they saw its application to the Samaritans, and because they desired to see its fulfilment among them also. And how did they proceed in obtaining its fulfilment? Is it likely that they would without any divine direction adopt a new way, or that they would adopt a way contrary to the Divine will? They would certainly follow the course which had been already followed. The reception of the Spirit by those who heard Peter at Pentecost was not His original descent, which was an act necessarily immediate. It was a subsequent and consequent event. They would not wait for the descent of the Spirit, as at Pentecost; but they would expect a repetition of that which afterwards occurred. And how did they act? They prayed, no doubt; for what grace can come without prayer? But did they do no more? Did they wait for the descent of the Spirit, no one knows how or where? No. They laid their hands on the baptized believers, and thereupon those believers received the Holy Ghost. Thus the Pentecostal promise was fulfilled by the instrumentality of man's will to go and pray, and of man's act in the laying on of hands. But why should any one go? And why should Apostles go? Could not the baptized themselves have prayed? Could not Philip have prayed with and for them? Could not Philip have laid his hands on them? The Apostles went because more than prayer was needed. Prayer by one standing in an ordinance was needed. And more than such prayer was needed. The laying on of hands was needed. And more than the laying on of hands was needed. The laying on of *those* hands was needed, by which alone God had appointed to give the Holy Ghost. Peter and John went down; and there they prayed that, while they should fulfil the ordinance by laying on their hands, the grace of God might accompany, and the gift of God might follow, their voluntary act as His ministers. *Then* they laid their hands

on them, and the disciples received the Holy Ghost. (Acts viii. 17.) And this is spoken of as tantamount to the Holy Ghost falling upon the baptized believers.

In like manner, when Paul came to Ephesus (Acts xix.), he dealt with the Gentiles as Peter and John had done with the Jews and the Samaritans. By baptism he brought them into that position in which the promise of God through Peter applied to them. By the laying on of his hands with prayer he fulfilled that promise, as God's minister, as Christ's hand. The Holy Ghost fell upon them. They received the gift of the Holy Ghost—not by chance, not as divine favourites, not by arbitrary grace, but in the faithfulness of God to the voluntary act of an authorized man fulfilling a divine ordinance.

Hence we see, then, that the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the baptized, since the day of Pentecost, so far from dispensing with or excluding the intervention of man, implies not only the laying on of man's hands, but the limitation thereof to the hands of Apostles, as distinct from those who preach or baptize. At Pentecost the Holy Ghost came indeed on the Apostles immediately from Christ, but not immediately from God. He was ministered by the risen man. The Apostles received Him immediately from Christ, because there was no minister between Christ and them. But thereupon they became the permanent and exclusive ministers of the Spirit to the Church. By the one act, testimony was borne to the truth that the Holy Ghost is God and proceeds from God; by the other, to the truth that He is the Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus, and imparted by Christ through man. By the one, to His being the Spirit of the Father and the Son; by the other, to His bestowal from the Father through the Son. Like as the Church, although enjoying the same fellowship with the Father and the Son which Apostles have, is yet admitted into it as into their fellowship and by their doctrine, so, although she has the same gift of the Holy Ghost as Apostles have, yet she is admitted to partake of it as Christ's gift to them, and therefore through the laying on of their hands. And as the Holy Ghost has the whole Church for His temple, and is Himself undivided, He is rightly ministered solely by those who are set over the whole Church as a unity. He who ministereth the Spirit to the saints (Gal. iii. 5) must be an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ. To receive the Spirit by the hearing of faith, does not mean that the Spirit descends arbitrarily or immediately on those

who believe the preaching of Christ, but implies that those who have believed the Gospel generally, and received baptism, do also believe the special truth that Jesus is the baptizer with the Holy Ghost, and that they do therefore, in faith of that fact, come to Him as such, that they may receive that baptism with the Holy Ghost through the appointed ordinance of Apostles' hands. In other words, the ministration of the Spirit—the Christian dispensation pre-eminently—that which distinguishes the Church from all previous and from all other present believers—that which is more glorious than the law—is not an arbitrary grace or immediate descent, but a ministry—a permanent ordinance and way of God, fulfilled, like those of the law, and like all others now, through the mediation of man. The act of God at Pentecost was not a conveyance then finished, but the opening of a continual stream—not the first of a series of fortuitous endowments, but the institution of a fixed dispensation—not a transitory wonder, to astonish men and leave them where they were, but the investment of man with certain new and permanent privileges peculiar to the Christian dispensation.

But there are two passages in the Acts of the Apostles which seem to conflict with this view. The one, where we are told that the Holy Ghost fell upon the centurion and his company, yet unbaptized, without any ministerial act, but merely during the preaching of Peter; the other, where, as is generally supposed, we read that the Holy Ghost was given to Paul while yet a mere Jew, through the hands of Ananias, a layman, at least no Apostle. (Acts x. 44; ix. 17.)

As to the first, it must be remembered that the question is not whether the Holy Ghost can fall on *any* man without the laying on of hands, but whether it is the will of God that He should do so on the baptized—on members of the Church. The centurion and his house were unbaptized. They were afterwards baptized, on the ground, not merely that they were believers, but also that, by an extraordinary grace of God, they were already possessed of that which is the prerogative of the body of Christ. The dealings of God towards those without the Church cannot be quoted to subvert the order of His dealings in the Church. As the centurion and his house had not access to the ordinance for ministering the Spirit, they could not receive the Spirit through an ordinance. They must have either remained without the gift, or received it in an extraordinary manner.

It pleased God that they should receive it; therefore it came as it did. Moreover, if we look at the circumstances of the gift, the difficulty disappears. This was the first visitation of the Gentiles by God—before the rejection of the Jews. It was an act hard enough to acknowledge after that rejection—doubly hard before it—the breaking down of the wall of partition in Him in whom there is neither Jew nor Gentile—the exhibition of that mystery, which had been hid from ages and from generations, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs and of the same body (Eph. iii. 5)—of that mystery of which Paul was the proper steward. It was an act for which Peter himself, in his ignorance, needed to be prepared by an express vision. In order, then to show not only that the Gentiles were to share in the privileges of the Jews, but that they were to do so on an independent footing and not as subsidiary to the Jews, God repeated, as far as it could be repeated, the act done at Pentecost, and gave to the Gentiles the Holy Ghost, not through the Jews, but direct. This, however, did not prove that *baptized* Gentiles should receive the Spirit without Apostles. It might as well be used to prove that Gentiles need not be baptized in order to receive the Spirit, and thus to contradict the promise through Peter. It merely proved that they were to receive the Spirit from Christ, and not from the Jewish polity.

The second passage is the precise counterpart of the first. Paul was unbaptized. He was not a member of Christ. He could not receive the Spirit through Apostles, who were sent to give the Spirit to the Church alone. If he was to receive the Spirit, he behoved to do so in another and extraordinary manner; for his position was abnormal. It pleased God that, like the centurion, Paul should so receive the gift, and be subsequently baptized; and so it was. Moreover, even granting that he received the Holy Ghost through the hands of Ananias, we can see reasons for his receiving the gift through the hands of a man which did not apply to the case of Cornelius. Paul, though the predestined Apostle to the Gentiles, was himself a Jew. God showed otherwise that his *Apostleship* was not derived from the Jews. But there was no necessary call to assert his independent reception of the Spirit as a man. There was, therefore, no bar to his receiving the gift through a man; although, being not in the Church, he could not receive it through an Apostle. A man may have been used extraordinarily as the instrument to establish and illustrate the order of God in blessing man by

man. Indeed, had the impossible case occurred that Paul had received the Spirit through the other Apostles, it would have been difficult to vindicate his Apostleship from subordination to that of the Twelve, in the then condition of their minds. But the text does not really oblige, if it even allows, us to conclude that Paul received the Holy Ghost through the hands of Ananias. The presumption is always against the employment of a man to do that to which he has not been sent. Ananias was sent expressly to restore the sight of Paul by the laying on of hands, but he had no express commission to bestow on him the gift of the Holy Ghost through the same means. Paul was baptized after receiving his sight, and the probability is that the Holy Ghost fell on him after his baptism.

These two instances, therefore, rather confirm than overthrow our statement as to the right way of God. And the same may be said of those cases in which, in all ages and parts of the Church, the gifts of the Holy Ghost have, ever since the disappearance of Apostles, manifested themselves. As Christ, though hindered in doing His Father's will among us, is still on high, and does it as far as our perverseness and ignorance will allow—as the Holy Ghost, though grieved and quenched, is still in the Church, and manifests Himself as far as He can—as the ministries of Christ, though crippled and perverted, are still the basis and essence of all divine ministry which survives among us,—so do the gifts of the Holy Ghost, although not in their proper channel, still appear to our comfort. God does not wholly withdraw Himself from a condition of things which He disapproves. He never says, like rash and reckless man, “Either the perfect thing or nothing.” He follows His children, in their error and ignorance, with His blessing, in so far as consists with His wisdom. He still regards us as the temple of the Holy Ghost; and without approving of the usurpation of Apostleship by bishops, or of the rejection of Apostleship *in toto*, He has acknowledged the Episcopal hand stretched out for want of a better, and has, through the laying on of bishops' hands, answered the faith of His children in their Pentecostal standing, even while they were rejecting his Pentecostal ministry. He shows us that while He requires us to seek Him in His ordinances under the penalty of grievous loss, He is above, and independent of, them all. We must ever thankfully acknowledge and accept the abnormal operation of His sovereign grace, but we dare not use that operation as an argument against His legitimate mode of working, by demanding that

the exception shall be the rule. It is hardly necessary to add, that Apostles cannot, from the nature of the case, receive the Spirit through one another, or through any other ordinance. The equal cannot be blessed of the equal, or the greater of the less. Those who minister from Christ to the Church cannot be mediately blessed. The Pentecostal act is continued to the present day.

4. Apostles are Christ's ministers for the constitution of all other ministers in the Church. Every minister of Christ stands, as every member does, in a direct relation to Him. He is not the minister of Apostles, but the minister of the Lord; he ministers not from Apostles, but from the Lord. The question, however, is not whether his ministration is immediate, but whether his constitution as a minister is so; and the answer is clear in the negative. No man can call himself to office. He must be called by the Holy Ghost—either, as a priest, through prophecy, or its temporary equivalents; or, as a deacon, by the choice of the flock. In like manner, none can appoint himself to office; he must be appointed by another in the stead of Christ; and that other must be over him in the Lord: the less is blessed of the greater. There is a parity in ministration, but a gradation in place and office. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors minister alike from the Lord and to the whole Church; but Apostles alone are over the whole. They are the sole visible authority over all in Christ. They dare not constitute whom they please; they must select from those called of the Holy Ghost. They dare not constitute how they please; they must be helped by their counsellors. But they alone can constitute and ordain. As the call is the work of the Holy Ghost through the prophet, or the flock, so is ordination the work of Christ the Lord, through Apostles. They may, in special cases, delegate their ordination to others (Tit. i. 5); but the power is theirs alone, and returns to them when the delegation expires. And that power is exercised, not in the mere giving of mission, nor in the mere blessing of those sent, nor in the mere conferring of grace on those called, but also in the constitution of the minister, in the creation of the ministry. The Holy Ghost indicates whom they shall create, but Christ creates in the spiritual world through them. The Holy Ghost, given by their hands, fills those created with the requisite grace, but Christ fashions through them the vessel which is thus filled. So it was in the beginning with the deacons, with the elders, with the angels. So also with Timothy, who was probably

called through Silas. (Acts vi. 6; xiv. 23; Rev. iii. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6.) And we know from history that John followed this course in Asia, ordaining those whom the Holy Ghost had called or indicated.

5. Apostles are the sole rulers over the whole Church in all things, whether pertaining to doctrine, discipline, or life. In other words, they represent Christ not only as the baptizer of the whole Church with one Spirit, but also as the ruler of the whole Church according to one law. They not only minister to the whole that Spirit who inclines their hearts as one to keep God's law, but they have the sole prerogative of writing one code of laws in the heart of one body, by which the whole, having one will, may learn from Christ's authority what to believe and what to do. The gift of the Spirit and that of the law are co-extensive, and come by one ordinance; for as Moses was faithful in all his house, so is Christ in His. He supplies us not only with God's presence, but with His government; and He does both through men. But what men? If the body is one, then assuredly not by men set only each over his own part, but by men set conjointly over the whole; not by men who usurp or are voted, whether tacitly or expressly, into universal rule, but by men whose commission is originally divine and universal, both in fact and in the purpose of God. And who are these, who can these be, but Apostles? They alone can minister the one Spirit; they alone can publish and maintain the common faith, however helped to the knowledge and diffusion of the same by the counsel and ministry of the body, and however incapable of doing it without such aid; they alone can institute that one worship which is rendered to God by the whole through one head; they alone can furnish the Church with one rule of life, which each in his place has to apply; they alone can put into the mouth of every minister and member one testimony. It is, indeed, a spiritual rule—a rule not over ignorant slaves, but over the enlightened and the willing. Its sanctions, too, are all spiritual. Yet both the rule and the sanctions are real and cogent. The rule is no *sham*, the sanctions no empty promises or threats. He that yields to it, yields to Christ; he that resists it, resists Christ. It varies in its application, and is carried out by the help of many; but its essence is one, and it is vested in one ordinance. It is not a concord of many powers, but the embrace of one. It proceeds from One who is essentially over all, entitled to demand the joint obedience of all; and, therefore, it makes all one. It alone can fulfil the mystery of God; it

alone can lead in the way of life ; it alone can do those works which shall stand the fire throughout the whole Church, as the one body under one living, unchangeable Head. Apostles guide all ministries, direct the right use of all gifts, preside in all councils. Of their ministry Peter thus speaks : " Be mindful of the commandment of the Apostles, *being that of the Lord and Saviour*" (2 Pet. iii. 2). Of it Paul speaks : " Let him acknowledge that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of Christ" (1 Cor. xiv. 37). Of it the Lord speaks : " All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth—*therefore* make disciples of all nations—baptize them, and *teach* them all that I have commanded you—and behold, *I am with you always, even to the end of the world*" (Matt. xxviii. 18).

But what is implied under this universal rule ?

First : That Apostles have a peculiar fellowship with Christ in His counsels as ruler, and responsibility to fulfil His rule, with the counsel and help of their fellow-labourers in the Universal Church. Our Lord, while on earth, made known to them all things which He had heard from His Father. (John xv. 15.) Much He then revealed to them which He kept hid not only from the world and the Jews, but from all other disciples. After His resurrection He taught His Apostles alone the things of the kingdom ; He instructed them to teach others what He had commanded them. He promised to be with them to the end of the world. And Paul says, " Let a man so account of us as stewards of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. iv. 1). They alone are admitted to share in the multiform unity of Christ's counsels. To them is entrusted the judgment and application of all revelations made to others, that the whole may stand in one analogy of faith. They are bound to tell all ministers what to minister, and how, and to fix all their borders. And as the angel of each church is bound to carry out among all under him the traditions of Apostles (1 Cor. xi. 2), so are they bound to see that the commandments of the Lord are delivered to and obeyed by all the angels of the churches in the unity of one government.

Second : Apostles govern the use of all gifts of the Spirit. The gift does not rule the man, but is a gift to him. To use that gift aright, he must be a holy man, and know the counsel and order of the Lord. Apostles have to see to it, not only that men are holy, but that they use their gifts in unity and wisdom—as responsible persons, not mere machines. And in every church Apostles do this by angels—the high priests

on whose garment hang both the bells and the pomegranates, the ministries and the gifts.

Third: Apostles lead the Church into one way of worship. God accepts the devotion of every heart; but as the offerers must be sanctified by the Holy Ghost, so must their offering be ordered by Christ, as that of one body, on one basis, in one way. To the Apostles the Lord said, "After this manner pray ye." The Church continued in the fellowship of Apostles' prayers as well as of their spiritual endowment and doctrine. The Apostles directed the order of her prayers (1 Tim. 2), and Paul promised to set all things in order when he should come (1 Cor. xi. 34; xiv. 40). The prayers of the Church are offered in many places and circumstances, but they distinguish themselves from all private prayer in this, that they are the prayers of one body, of which the parts are all members one of another; and no prayers can rightly be those of the whole body but those which it receives from them who are at the foundation of the Church and preside over the whole. As the basis of all approach to God is the accepted sacrifice of Christ, so is the basis of all public worship the memorial of that sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist. To the Apostles alone did the Lord say, "Do this in remembrance of me." In the fellowship of their breaking of bread did the Church continue. Paul gave to the Church in this matter that which he had received of the Lord. And as the basis, so the superstructure. If we cannot force our own way to God, as little can we force upon Him the offering, or the manner thereof, which our own self-will or fancy dictates. Our boldness of access into the Holiest does not give us licence to do there what we list in our piety. On the contrary, there do we learn what the offerings and order are which God appoints, and, because by Him appointed, accepts. He whom we approach must tell us how; He who gives us the will to serve Him must tell us how. And by Apostles, as the stewards of His mysteries, does He not only reveal His present will, but realize the shadows of the tabernacle and the law, bringing forth the very image of that pattern which Moses saw in the mount, and after which alone he wrought in making the shadow.

Fourth: Apostles are the sole presidents in general councils. They are not separate from the Church; they act with the help of counsel and light in every form. But they are the agents. They are not the mouth-piece of an assembly; that assembly is only their help in judging how to act. They preside in councils, not as voted into the chair,

but as rulers who ask for help. And as they preside in the councils of the Universal Church, so do the angels in those of the particular. (Acts xv.)

Fifth : Apostles furnish the Church for her testimony to the world. This consists of three parts—the life of her members, the word of her messengers, and the signs following. As to the first: The commission of the Apostles to teach the disciples all which they had heard from Jesus was not confined to doctrine and mysteries, but extended itself to conduct also. Jesus not only left us an example that we should walk in His steps, but delivered the sermon on the mount as the great rule of our conduct. So also Paul wrote : “Be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ” (1 Cor. xi. 1). Again : “Ye have received from us how ye ought to walk” (1 Thess. iv. 1). And again : “As ye have us for examples” (Phil. iii. 17). And yet again : “Ye became followers of us, and of the Lord” (1 Thess. i. 6). Without the example of Apostles, each section of the Church can do no better than frame a moral code for itself from texts of Scripture, or mould its conduct in any one-sided or morbid form presented by that of influential individuals ; and its conduct will never be the true counterpart of its testimony. As to the second, if the wicked lives of Christians have neutralized the testimony of the Church, their divisions have no less confounded it ; every sort of gospel is preached ; rival sects counterwork each other among the heathen ; and those to whom the Gospel is brought are either directed to no ark of safety whatever, and learn nothing of God’s presence in His Church, or are torn in pieces by the pretensions of rival churches. Instead of being a steady beacon of hope, and the salt of the earth, the Church is the minister of perplexity and the source of corruption. The testimony of the Church as a holy unity to the world can never be given without Apostles. The Lord, in His great intercessory prayer, prayed first for them, and next for all who should believe through them ; that during the period when He should be with the Father—*i.e.*, in the present dispensation—they might be one, as He and the Father were one. This He sought as the appointed means of bringing the world to believe that the Father had sent Him. And if His prayer cannot go unanswered, this shall yet be seen during the present dispensation. But if the Gospel cannot be rightly preached and believed without this unity, this unity can never come save through Apostles. It cannot be the junction of things separate ; it must be the development of an

existing unity in Christ, and the endowment of the Church as a corporate body. Thus, in like manner, although the sin of the Church has separated the signs following from the preaching of the Word—although generally God no longer thus bears witness to His Word, and it has sunk to be a mere proposition proved by the reason and submitted to the judgment of man, yet the Scriptures sanction no such separation. On the contrary, if there is now no longer any present promise of the signs following, there is, by parity of reason, now no longer any present commission to preach. But how can the Church preach with signs following, if she herself be destitute of the Holy Ghost? How can the Spirit manifest His power without, if He do not manifest Himself within? If His gifts to the Church must come through the hands of Apostles, must not His wonders among the heathen flow from the same source? The Apostles with great power bore witness to the resurrection of Jesus—God witnessed with them by signs and wonders. But this was the very testimony concerning which Jesus said, “Tarry till ye be endowed with power from on high, and ye shall be witnesses unto me.” A church with Apostles *may* fail to fulfil her calling, for all men may fail, but a church without Apostles *must*. It can neither perfect holiness, nor with one heart and mouth preach the Gospel, nor show those mighty deeds by which the Word is proved to be that of God indeed.

6. Lastly : Apostles are called to present the Church as a chaste spouse to the Lord. The bride is one, holy, and adorned. As the commission to preach, to baptize, to teach, to endow with the Holy Ghost, and to supply with holy ordinances, is the commission to seek the bride, so is the nourishing, cleansing, furnishing, and perfecting of the Church the bringing of the bride thus found unto the Bridegroom. Both commissions Apostles have received, as Eliezer did from Abraham of old. One they have executed, the other they have yet to fulfil. And as the faithful servant of Abraham neither tarried by the way nor devolved his errand upon another, so should Apostles be zealous and finish their work themselves. We read that Christ loved the Church and gave Himself for her, that He might sanctify her, washing her with water through the word, and present her unto Himself, glorious—the Church (*i.e.*, diverse from every previous body called out by God) which has neither spot nor wrinkle nor any such thing, but holy and without blemish. (Eph. v. 25.) This, indeed, He alone can do ; but we nowhere read that He is to do it without instrumentality. On the contrary,

we read that Apostles are His instruments for that very end. Paul writes that he had espoused the Church unto one husband, to be presented unto Him as a chaste virgin. (2 Cor. xi. 2.) He with his companions laboured to present every man perfect in Christ. (Col. i. 28.) He travailed again in birth that Christ might be formed in His children. (Gal. iv. 19.) And Apostles first, then all other ministers as their fellow-labourers, were given, until the whole Church should reach the perfect man, the stature of that fulness of Christ which the Church is called to be. (Eph. iv. 13.)

II.—PERMANENCY.

II. Such is the nature of the Apostolic office. Was this office, then, intended to be permanent? The answer is clear in the affirmative; and that for the following among many reasons.

1. The dispensations of God to man may change. We know that they have done so. Each one since the beginning has been a fresh step in the development of His purpose, and towards its complete development in the Christian Church—the last and fullest dispensation—that in which man occupies the highest place to which he is destined, and in which he shall be brought to perfection—that dispensation which began with the perfecting of Christ at His ascension, and shall be fulfilled by the perfecting of His members at His return. But during the course of each dispensation the way of God is unchangeable; especially, then, during the last—in which man is seen, not preparing for promotion, but occupying in Christ his eternal place. God is now manifest in the flesh: man is now a partaker of the divine nature. The unchangeable Christ is the revelation of the unchangeable God. As the Father was, and is, and is to come, so is now the Son, invested with the Father's glory in flesh. And though we may deny Him, He cannot deny Himself. He can as little deny His constitution as His attributes. He is one as God is one. The Church is His body—though not corporeally, yet as really as if corporeally. The fashion of this His body, and the functions of its parts, are the impression of His character and the instrument of His operation who filleth all in all. Therefore they are in God's purpose as unchangeable as Himself—as His character and operation. The ignorance, uncleanness, and rebellion of man may obscure, impede, or resist the development of the body of Christ; but the divine scheme of the Church cannot be changed. If we

have not passed out of the Pentecostal dispensation into another, we ought to be, to possess and to do all that God made us, gave to us, and enjoined on us at the first. And supposing even that we had, the change must have been an advance, not a retrogression. But is it so? It is surely no progress to have exchanged the ways of God for those of man, or, to say the best, to have exchanged divine ordinances, expressly named in Scripture, for others at best merely providential, on which Scripture is wholly silent.

2. God has nowhere in Scripture indicated His intention to retract any of His ordinances as temporary. Many words of Scripture point to the havoc which man should work in the House of God; others even indicate the gracious provision which God in His wonderful condescension would make, not for supplanting a better order of things by a worse, but for shielding us from the full penalty of our perverseness, until the better order should come,—in like manner as Saul was made a channel of blessing to those who had sinned in desiring a king, and Babylon a place of blessing to those who were led captive into it. And those very Scriptures which promise the return of God to His people clearly imply that He should have left them for a time. But there is not one which declares that any ordinance of God was intended to cease during the Christian dispensation, or that our destitute condition is the proper exponent of His purpose. Such an idea is a pure invention of man, has its origin in his desire to justify himself, and is in fact an accusation of God. Men find the Church at variance with God's description, departed from His constitution; and instead of measuring their sin thereby, and returning to Him with weeping, they fabricate and palm upon Him a theory of the Church which shall suit and justify the facts. The Twelve had a far greater show of reason for resisting the accession of Paul than we have for asserting that Apostleship should have ceased with John. The Lord knew nothing of this novel theory when He said, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world"—not with dead Apostles, or the children of Apostles, but with living Apostles teaching the Church. The commendation of the church at Ephesus for detecting false Apostles (probably men who could say that they had seen the Lord, and who professed far more disinterested love than the true ones) (2 Cor. xi. 13) would have been a most undeserved one if the primitive Church had been as certain as we that Paul and John should be the last. The simple answer would have been, "We know you

are deceivers, because there are to be no more Apostles, and John alone survives. We know that this coin is a forgery, because there is and can be no such true coin." On the contrary, "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance." (Rom. xi. 29). If God can repent of having given Apostles, why may He not also repent of having called us in one body to His kingdom? If Apostles are set in the body, and set first, then wherever the body is seen, there should Apostles be seen. (1 Cor. xii. 28.) If dead Apostles suffice, why not dead preachers and pastors too? Nay, why not dead saints? If Apostles themselves are now unnecessary, their writings are much more so; for their writings were but a substitute for their presence; and Apostles are not with us by their writings as Jesus is with us by the Holy Ghost. Lastly, if Apostles were God's greatest blessing to the Church, God is partial in granting to one generation of the Church that which He purposely denies to all the rest—in feeding the former with the feast, and in leaving the latter to gather the crumbs.

3. The work assigned to Apostles has always been, and now is, as necessary as at the beginning. The only part of the work which can with any propriety be alleged as no longer necessary is the gathering of the Church out of the world. But this is the very part which those who will have no Apostles insist on as most necessary now. With them the preaching to the heathen—a work which, though of constant obligation, the present condition of the Church makes false and fruitless—is at present our prime duty, and the perfecting of the Church herself a mere secondary object. If they will hear of Apostles at all, they would send them to the heathen, and leave the bride to prepare herself as she best can. We admit, nay, we assert, that Apostles have not now to gather the Church; but we do not admit that on that account their work has changed; for the gathering and the perfecting are parts of one work, though done at different times. We see in the beginning that, on the appointment of deacons at Jerusalem, on the ordination of ministers for each particular flock, and on the sending out of others as evangelists, the Apostles were gradually enabled to divest themselves of the accidents of their office, in order the better to devote themselves to its essence, according as the progress of God's work should call it forth. The gathering of the Church out of the world, and the appointment of other ministers, was not the signal for the disappearance of Apostles, but the signal for the commencement of their

proper work,—to build up and arrange the body—to prepare the bride—to sanctify the Church—to make her Christ's fullness—to exhibit in all the baptized, not merely in the preachers, those signs which follow faith—to finish the mystery of God. All this lies yet before Apostles; and unless we are prepared to substitute the name of the Church for the name of Christ, the covetousness of rival sects for the testimony of one holy body, systems of truth for its power, the authority of man for that of God, and his schemes and craft for God's counsels and mighty works, we need Apostles as much as ever.

When has the Church ceased to need the speaking of Jesus from Heaven—the testimony that He is on the right hand of power? When has she ceased to need the living waters—not waters which once were in the fountain and are now cut off from it, but waters ever flowing from it? Is Christ no longer to fill all in all? Is a forsaken temple now His glory? Are the mysteries of God now antiquated and exhausted? are they no longer mysteries? Is each man the steward of them for himself; or are they the booty of a democracy? Is it enough that God's law was written in the hearts of our forefathers? Have we now got it all snug on paper? Are they not dead also? Is there a separate law for every province, a separate spirit for every section, a separate order of worship for every congregation of the Church? Can the Church now rule herself? Shall she be a congress of independent governments? Shall kings, councils, majorities, or religious idols rule her? When came the auspicious moment at which the Church could say, Hitherto I have drawn from Christ—now from myself; hitherto His hand has built me—I shall now build myself? Shall she be left to construct her faith and practice from the fragments of distorted tradition, or to believe and do what she lists? Is it left to every pious club to constitute itself the salt of the earth, and send out its messengers? May every arrogant individual stir up his zeal, while the Lord of Hosts slumbers, to take on his puny shoulders the burden of the world, and to catch what he can in his private net? May Christian wickedness now deter the heathen with impunity? May we invite them into a forsaken temple, or name them with the rival names of men? Must the Church now yield to the routine of misery, and bow to the eternal necessity of death? May she now cease to wait for the Son of Man from Heaven? May she present herself to Him without any to bring her?

May she appear before Him disintegrated, impure, and unadorned? May she consent to stand among a host of claimants to His hand and throne? Quite otherwise speak the Scriptures, when they say that Apostles were given for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.

Let us also look at the negative side of the picture. Apostles were given that we might be no longer children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine. Is this work of preservation no longer needed? Is the Church now capable of strong meat? Are not orthodoxy and the pap of babes identical in her eyes? Is not her only idea of strong meat that of scientific arrangement and critical research? Does she ever desire such meat as the knowledge of those things which Christ, her Apostle and High Priest, now transacts in the Jerusalem which is above? Does she understand what it is to be of the perfect in Christ, to whom the strong meat belongs? Are not God's children tossed on the waves of the world, forgetful of the ship and its only steersman? Do they not share the fate as well as the character of the heathen? Are they not carried away by every spiritual novelty—uncertain in every article of faith—taking refuge in ignorance instead of knowledge—wandering in twilight—the prey of every deceiver—in danger of receiving Antichrist for Christ? And why? Because the Holy Ghost, the Comforter in the stead of Jesus, is quenched—because the guides whom Jesus sends are lost—because there are none who can say with authority to the whole body, “This is the way.” And this applies with peculiar force to the present time of the end, in which we see not only error permitted of God, but strong delusion *sent by Him* in judgment, that those who would not believe the true may believe the lie. Delusion sent by God can be exposed by none but men sent by Him. The apostasy pervades the whole body; and none but Apostles sent to the whole can pluck men out of the fire, and in the name of the Lion of the tribe of Judah divide the prey with the mighty.

4. The work of Apostles is not merely necessary still, but was expressly appointed to continue till a certain end should be attained. They were given to work till we all come unto the unity of the faith and of the recognition of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Their work does not cease till we have not only one object of faith, but one faith in

regard to that object—until we not only all recognize the Son of God, but all recognize Him in one way, and recognize Him in all His offices—until Christ, the Second Adam, out of whom the Church is taken, for whom she is prepared, and of whom she is the fulness, shall really have made her partaker of His own perfection—until we shall all have reached the full measure of that spiritual stature which belongs to those who are really His fulness, and which constitutes the Head and body into one compact Christ—complete in holiness, number, and endowment. Is this end attained? If not, the work of Apostles still continues. Let us learn from earthly things. The building of an edifice for an end known to the builder may be interrupted. The workmen may be dismissed, the materials may be scattered, the tokens of ruin may abound, the wild beasts may lodge in the chambers, the plan be violated, the use may be perverted; but there is the edifice still—the plan—the workmen—the materials—above all, the builder himself. The cessation of the work is not the attainment of the end. And if the end is to be attained, the work must be revived by the same builder with the same workmen and materials. Apostles must subsist till the end, or return before it.

But we must remember that Apostles were given to finish the work of God, not to help men with man's make-shifts while God's work is at a stand. They were not given to continue with the Church throughout 1,800 years, and help her to endure the curse which their own absence itself has entailed upon her. Their continuance with the Church throughout such a life as she has dragged out, is inconceivable; it would have been a contradiction in terms. Although Apostles, like other men, may be unfaithful to their calling, yet standing still is at variance with the essence of their office and the fact of their presence. Their work is a continual travail in birth. The Church has undergone many a change and experienced much since they disappeared, but she has not progressed a step; and as progress is impossible without them, so does their presence assure us that God will lead us unto perfection.

5. The abiding symbols of the tabernacle, such as the four pillars, the six boards, and the commission of Moses not only to build and order the tabernacle, but to direct its worship, &c., till the Jews should reach the land of promise, typically instruct us as to the intended duration of the Apostolic office.

III.—CONSTITUTION.

III. The constitution of the Apostolic office is to be regarded in two lights. The first question is—What is not necessary to Apostleship? The second—What is necessary to it? We now address ourselves to the first.

1. It was not necessary to Apostleship that one should have been personally chosen by the Lord, as the Twelve were in the days of His flesh. Matthias and Barnabas never were. Of Matthias we know that he was an Apostle; and although his case is sufficient to prove the exception, and although the fact of the Apostleship of Barnabas affects as little the subsequent argument as it does this, yet there are strong grounds for believing that Barnabas also was an Apostle, standing in a relation to Paul in some respects similar to that of Benjamin to Judah. Barnabas has indeed been reckoned with the Seventy, all of whom the Oriental Church styles Apostles, partly on the ground of their work, and partly on that of their having been "*sent out*" after, but in like manner as, the Twelve, although the Lord called the Twelve *alone* APOSTLES. But, on the other hand, in Acts xiv. 12, 14, Barnabas is expressly called an Apostle, and ranked even prior to Paul. Lest we should regard them both on that occasion as merely Apostles from the churches, and not as Apostles of the Lord, we find, in Acts xiv. 23, that they both performed acts of ordination to which Apostles alone were competent. And when Paul and Barnabas quarrelled, we find Barnabas pursuing the same independent course as Paul. Moreover, in 1 Cor. ix. 6, where Paul treats expressly of the office, credentials, and privileges of an Apostle, he couples Barnabas with himself. And lastly, when the Apostles at Jerusalem recognized not only the Apostleship of Paul as one with theirs, but his mission to the Gentiles as divine, they recognized Barnabas, who had before introduced Paul to the Apostles, as having the same common office and distinct mission which Paul had. Yet they gave no such recognition to Titus, although he was also a companion of Paul (Gal. ii. 1, 2, 7—9; Acts ix. 26), and although he afterwards, like Timothy, became an Apostolic delegate, invested with temporary and limited commission to do certain Apostolic works in the name and during the lifetime of Paul (1 Tim. i. 3; iii. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 14; ii. 2; iv. 2, 5, 9; Titus i. 5; ii. 15; iii. 12). Whether Epaphroditus, Andronicus, and Junius were all Apostles, we need not here inquire. It would seem that

Epaphroditus was merely an Apostle of the churches, from the contrast of the Greek pronouns in Phil. ii. 25. As to the others, although there is more for it, yet the words may merely mean that they were distinguished members of the Apostolic company. (Rom. xvi. 7.)

2. It was not necessary for an Apostle to have companied with the Lord from the beginning, although that was made a requisite at the choice of Matthias. Paul never did so; and if Barnabas did, it was not as a chosen Apostle.

3. It was not necessary to have seen the Lord after His resurrection and before His ascension (Acts x. 41); nor to have been commissioned by Him, before the latter, to bear witness of the former; nor to have received the forty days' instruction from Him. Paul never saw Him so, nor received such a commission or such instruction. (1 Cor. xv. 8). If Barnabas and Matthias did, they did it not as Apostles; but there is no proof that they did it at all. The false Apostles (2 Cor. xi. 13) had probably seen the Lord as men, and made such a use of the fact in their pretensions, that Paul not only determined to rival them in their pretended disinterestedness, but asserted that he had seen the Lord as well as they. Of the vision of the ascended Lord, which Paul alone out of all the Apostles had, and of its true import, we shall afterwards speak, and we shall afterwards give the true exposition of 1 Cor. ix. 1. But this is clear, that when Paul says, "Have I not seen the Lord?" he not only makes no pretension to have seen Him when the Twelve did, but does not adduce that event as that which made him an Apostle. It was merely the manner of, or preparation for, his call; and his mere assertion that he had seen the Lord could not and ought not to have proved his Apostleship to any.

4. It was not necessary to have been with the 120 at Pentecost, or to have received the Holy Ghost at His first descent. Paul was not there.

5. It was not necessary to have been personally constituted and sent by the Lord at all—*i.e.*, to be able to say, "I as an Apostle have seen the Lord," or "I have been personally called by the Lord to be an Apostle, and personally sent as such by Him." We need not here inquire as to the nature and effect of Paul's vision, either on the way, or subsequently in the Temple. Neither Matthias nor Barnabas fulfilled any such condition. They may have been among the witnesses chosen of God, amounting in one instance to

500, who saw Christ after His resurrection. (Acts x. 41; 1 Cor. xv. 6.) But if they saw Him, He did not then and there make them Apostles.

The next question is, What is necessary to Apostleship?

1. It is necessary that one should be an Apostle, not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead. That is to say, his commission must be from God, not from man. His authority must flow, neither from the churches, nor from any other ministry, nor from another Apostle. He may be separated to his office by the Church, and thus lawfully liberated from obedience to inferior ordinances, that he may learn to rule; but that gives him no right to rule. His right must come from the Lord. Moreover, he must not be an Apostle through man. A divine ministry is not always immediate; and a mediate ministry is not on that account merely human. But in all cases save that of Apostleship, the ministry, although equally divine with that of the Apostle, is constituted through the instrumentality of another. The less is blessed of the greater. Here no such instrumentality is employed; the very nature of the case excludes it. The Father is the fountain of the Apostolic office, because He became the fountain of Christ's Apostleship when He raised Him from the dead. And through none save Jesus Christ, the Apostle of the Father, is the Apostolic office constituted in the Church. The Apostolic is the greater office, which constitutes and blesses all other offices, as the lesser. It is constituted and blessed by none in the Church, not even by Apostles—by none but the Father through Jesus Christ. The commission of Apostles is immediate; it comes, as the Holy Ghost comes, from the Father by the Son.

2. Nevertheless, it is necessary to be chosen of God before being constituted an Apostle; and that choice must not be secret or known only to him who is called. It must be declared in a manner palpable to the senses and apprehensible by the intellect of the Church. The essential thing is that the choice be that of God. That it shall be immediate in its form or declaration is not necessary. The choice of God is His gracious will to use a man in a certain way. How that will shall be expressed, to that person or to others, circumstances must determine. The mode in which God openly signifies His will varies with His dispensations—that is, with the relations in which men by His appointment stand to Him at the time. Before the Incarnation, God showed His will by a voice from Heaven—or by the prophets,

in whom the Holy Ghost, although not yet given, spoke as the Spirit of Christ—or by His disposal of the lot to those who sought Him thereby. After the Incarnation and before the Resurrection, God showed His will by the lips of Jesus Christ, who said, “I speak that which I have heard from my Father” (John xiv. 24; xv. 15). While Jesus was on earth, God never spoke from Heaven, save to attest His Son as the person by whom He would speak. When Jesus had ascended, God did not again speak audibly from Heaven as before; nor did Jesus speak in person in the Church. And why? The incarnation had taken place: the Holy Ghost was to come. Jesus had promised that when He should go to the Father, He would send from the Father, and the Father would send, in His name, the Holy Ghost, as another Comforter in His stead. Jesus, risen from the dead, the prophet like unto Moses, was appointed to speak from Heaven. That He was to do by the Holy Ghost, who should not speak of Himself, but only that which He should hear. (Acts iii. 22; Hebrews xii. 25; John xii. 16; xvi. 13—15.) And what was the way of God after Christ’s ascension and before the coming of the Holy Ghost? The Son, as the revealer of the Father, was incarnate, but He had gone to Heaven. The Holy Ghost was not yet given. Therefore, during that interval the lot was the way in which God expressed His will. But with the day of Pentecost that method ceased. Then the Holy Ghost came. He was not only omniscient as God, but was given as the Spirit of the Man Christ Jesus. He has ever since been as a divine person on earth, commissioned to speak as He hears from Christ. Whoever, therefore, would know the choice of God, should expect to hear it through the Holy Ghost on earth. And the Holy Ghost speaks by prophets, not incidentally, as in the former dispensation, but as through God’s standing ordinance to that end. The spirit of prophecy is the testimony of Jesus. (Rev. xix. 10.)

If, then, we inquire concerning the way in which God’s choice of Apostles is made known—in other words, concerning their call to office—we find that a *personal* call by the Lord, so far from being the only legitimate one, is only one of many modes, and was a mode in itself temporary, intended to give place to another more applicable to our present circumstances. The departure of Christ did not close the door against the call of Apostles, but opened the door for another and a permanent mode of call, similar to that of any other minister, and in strict analogy with the

essence of the Christian dispensation. While the Lord was on earth, He called Apostles by His own lips ; after His ascension, by lot ; after the day of Pentecost, by the word of prophecy. This takes for granted that the Spirit is present in the Church. But if it be asked, "How know we that it is the word of the Holy Ghost, and not that of man or devil, by which the call comes?" the answer is: "My sheep hear my voice. The voice of a stranger will they not follow." Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God (1 John iv. 1); and he to whom God entrusts His sheep, is sure of God's help, to try the spirits who speak in the midst of them.

It may be objected, however, that, after the day of Pentecost, Paul was called, not by prophecy, but by the Lord in person. To this our first answer is, that the time and mode of Paul's call are not so easily fixed. There is no proof that either of the visions of the Lord which he had constituted his call. (Acts ix. 2; xxii. 18.) On the contrary, the first was primarily the mode of his conversion, whatever indication of his future work may have accompanied it; the second was the expression of his mission when already an Apostle. And if we must point to any event as his call, it should rather be that which took place at Antioch, where, in the midst of the Church, the Holy Ghost expressly spake, saying that He had called Paul and Barnabas; although the work on which they went was not purely Apostolic, and Apostolic functions were only gradually developed in the course of the same. In the next place, the peculiar dealing with Paul (1 Cor. xv. 8), in the visions of the Lord granted to him, may be explained like that with Cornelius. Paul was not then in the Church. Granting that it was the will of the Lord to call him before he came into the Church, he would not be then called by prophecy. But it does not follow from this that he was not called of the Holy Ghost, or that he was called by the Lord in person. A sign was given that his Apostleship was not to be derived from that of the Twelve. Of them he says, that although they were Apostles before him (Gal. i. 17), yet he was not subject to them, and they added nothing to him (Gal. ii. 5, 6); for he did not come short of the chiefest among them (2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11), even of those who seemed to be pillars (Gal. ii. 9). They were called as Jewish believers, he as a Jewish persecutor, in whom Christ showed, as Paul himself styles it (1 Tim. i. 16), the full extent of His long-suffering. To show this, Paul required to be their equal. In the last

place, we nowhere read that Barnabas (supposing him to have been an Apostle) received either a personal call of any kind from the Lord, or a call by vision, to the Apostleship; but we do read that these two men, associated in Apostolic works, were also associated in their call at Antioch by the voice of prophecy.

3. It is also necessary that an Apostle shall be in the communion of, and educated in, the Church. If he is not, he is not in the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, and the spirit which he ministers is not the Holy Ghost. Although the Twelve, called by the Lord in person, did not need to be also called by prophecy, and although, as being themselves the rudiments of the Church, they would not be so called, yet, when they were constituted Apostles at Pentecost, they were found bound up in the communion of the disciples, praying with one accord in one place. None are constituted Apostles who are not standing in the body; and none can minister the Spirit who do not partake of the same; for the Church is the temple of the Holy Ghost. And although Apostles receive the Spirit, like their office, through no ordinance, they must share in the common gift to the Church. In like manner must Apostles be trained in the Church. The Twelve were trained by the Lord for three and a half years; and He continues, by the ordinances of the Church, that education which He began while on earth. Apostles must have first obeyed, that they may learn to rule; they must have first been taught, if they would teach. Every claim to Apostolic authority made by one standing apart from, and not nursed in, the Church, as in his mother's bosom, is to be rejected. But this nursing Church is the whole company of the baptized—not any one religious body, Romish, Greek, or Protestant.

Nor does the case of Paul here form any exception. He received the Holy Ghost, and was baptized, before he fulfilled any office in the Church. He did, indeed, receive his gospel by revelation (Gal. i. 11—16), for a testimony that the Gentile Apostleship was not derived from the Jewish. Yet, when that end had been served, not only was he attested by Barnabas to the Apostles at Jerusalem (Acts xi. 26), but he afterwards went up thither by revelation (Gal. ii. 2), for the express purpose of having his gospel proved, lest he should have run in vain. From that time not only were the two gospels acknowledged as one faith, and those who preached them as in one communion, but James, Cephas, and John, pillars among the Apostles to the circumcision, at the very

time when Paul says that he was neither subject to them nor required anything of them (Gal. ii. 5—9), nevertheless gave to both Paul and Barnabas, as Apostles to the heathen, the right hand of fellowship, as to members of one Apostleship (Gal. ii. 7—9). Nor is this all. After Paul had seen the Lord, received the Holy Ghost, and been baptized, he was in the communion of the church at Antioch, which was composed of Jews, and founded by Peter. There, as a witness for the whole extent of Christ's long-suffering (1 Tim. i. 16), he rose by gradual promotion to his Apostolic standing. First, as a disciple who had testified for the Lord (Acts ix. 20); then, as a deacon sent with Barnabas from Antioch to Jerusalem (Acts xi. 30); then, as a prophet or teacher (Acts xiii. 1), occasionally rising into his future Apostleship (Acts xiv. 23; xv. 36); then, as a delegate to the Apostles (Acts xv. 2); and lastly, in the fulness of his Apostleship, bestowing the Holy Ghost (Acts xix. 6), and charging the elders of the churches (Acts xx. 17, 28).

4. It is also necessary that an Apostle shall be recognized by the Church. Not that the Apostolic office is constituted by the recognition of man. Like all divine offices and acts, it is what it is, though all should deny it. Neither do we mean merely that it cannot be fulfilled among those who do not acknowledge it; as it claims the intelligent obedience of man, that were a truism: but we mean that, as the Church is the temple of the Holy Ghost, the voice of the Church, in so far as she walks in the Spirit, is the voice of God as truly as the voice of Christ is so. And the reception of Apostles by the Church is as much an act of the Holy Ghost as their call is. The voice of God is not always that of authority. The voice of the obedient Son and of the subservient Spirit is as truly that of God as the voice of the Father or the command of the Lord. To the right constitution of Apostles the testimony of God is required in every form which the constitution of the Church allows. An obedient reception is as necessary and as divine as an authoritative appointment. Paul says, "The seal of mine Apostleship are ye in the Lord." The Church, consenting to let God write His law on her heart, and to receive the ministration of His Spirit, ready to become Christ's epistle, written and ministered by Apostles, is God's testimony to them. (2 Cor. iii.; 1 Cor. ix.) Where the baptized do not receive Apostles, there Apostles cannot act, till they act in judgment. The Church may reject them and the blessing which they bring. They cannot impart it by force. But God will never be without those who shall

receive them when they are given ; and such alone will be found to constitute the perfect Church at the end, because such alone shall not only be saved from apostasy, but be in that condition in which alone the Church can adequately perform her functions.

5. And what else is essential to Apostleship ? Nothing but that the Lord shall really act, as Apostle, through those whom He has called and educated, among those who receive them. Their office is not to shake the world by preaching, and astonish it by miracles ; that is the work of others whom they appoint. Their place is to be unseen, like Him who is the foundation. Their work is to minister the Holy Ghost, as the seal of salvation, and to see that the will of God be done in the Church on earth as it is done in the Jerusalem above. They need to give no signs to unbelievers, for they do not ask unbelievers to receive them. If they work signs in the midst of the Church, such signs do not make them Apostles or give faith in their office, but are the seal of existing faith that they are already such. And if God show them signs—yea, if Jesus appear to them—it is not to make them Apostles, but to sustain their frailty. What visions the Lord may grant to them individually or collectively—how He may take them into the third heavens, as Paul (2 Cor. xii. 1), and show them that of which John prophesied—how He may make His glory to pass before them—how He may reveal Himself to them apart from the rest, or anterior to His appearing unto all,—these are questions of the deepest interest, in so far as the illustration of His goodness and mercy is concerned, but questions which man cannot answer, and which have nothing whatever to do with the call and constitution of Apostles.

IV.—DECAY.

IV. Let us now contemplate the decay of Apostleship.

Although the ordinances of Christ derive their being and authority from Him, and do at all times, even when not developed, subsist implicitly in the gift of the Holy Ghost, yet not only their efficiency but their visible continuance depends upon the faith and obedience of the Church. To this rule the Apostolic office forms no exception. The disappearance of that office is an admitted fact, and we must also admit that the event has been permitted of God ; but the question at issue regards the cause of this fact. All that we see does not come from God ; all that He permits is not,

therefore, His will. Whatever is is not, therefore, right. The grace of God, though almighty, may be resisted. Is the cause of this fact, then, to be sought for in the purpose of God, or in the unfaithfulness of the Church? We assert the latter; the burden of proof lies on those who assert the former. And we may easily trace the causes of this sad phenomenon.

The New Testament, especially the Epistles, clearly show how, from the first, the grace of Christ, in all His ministries and gifts, was more and more dis-esteemed or perverted, and, in particular, how the Apostolic office was resisted, questioned, and ultimately forfeited. The picture of spiritual prosperity drawn in some places—for instance, in the Epistle to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 17)—too soon lost its truth. Paul, the most outwardly efficient, and John, the most loving of the Apostles, were both forced to vindicate their Apostleship against those very churches which ought to have been its seal (1 Cor. ix. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 3; John iii. 9); and Paul complains to Timothy of being forsaken on every hand (2 Tim. i. 15; iv. 16). The hope of perfection—the hope of passing direct into that promised land, to the border of which the Church had been brought—soon became visionary. The Apostles, who should have brought in the kingdom and received the Lord at His return (Acts i. 11; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 17), were soon overborne by the sloth and perverseness of the Church. They spake of their death instead; they made provision for it. (2 Pet. i. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 6; Acts xx. 25.) And a glance at Church history may convince us that, as the Jews provoked God in the wilderness and paid the penalty, so has it been with us. Our chief provocations are those which we have committed as one body, and they regard especially those things wherein the office of Apostle most appears. The Church forgot her espousals, loving the world; and was no more a stranger and pilgrim. She lost that hope of being like Jesus when He cometh, which should have kept her pure as He is pure. She became so defiled, that one is grieved by the notices we find of the wickedness which prevailed in the very first centuries of the Church, and of the heresies which threatened to obliterate the truth. She rested on her Apostolic traditions and attainments, and sought neither continual progress nor the mighty power of Immanuel. Even during her period of martyrdom, and still more when that ceased, she looked to other comfort than that of the Holy Ghost. The light of prophecy in which the Church should walk and Apostles should rule, gradually

went out. The gifts which Apostles should bestow, cherish, and guide, disappeared. The truth of God became embalmed into a system, molten into an idol, graven into an image, gathered up into a fixed capital. There was no room and no heart left for fresh communications from Christ. These would have burst men's narrow systems and offended their self-conceit. The intellect of man, thrusting itself into the Holiest, was smitten with blindness and folly. Men ceased to draw from a common source, or to contribute to a common fund. The whole Church was puffed up for parties. In such a condition she could not keep the ways of the Lord. She claimed the favour of God in vain, when she had quenched the power, and broken the unity, of the Spirit. She sought unity in vain by the devices of man. Apostles could not perpetuate their kind. Even though they could have done so, their proper sphere of operation was gone. God did no more than give the Church the double of her sin when He withheld Apostles. Instead of Apostles, she got ambitious prelates; instead of prophets, isolated theosophs; instead of evangelists, sectarian agents; instead of pastors and teachers, snug parsons and learned critics. Like Israel of old, she has ever since wandered in the desert, a year for a day of her sin; judged, but not forsaken. Yet, although God thus punished the Church by the absence of Apostles, their presence would have been a sorer judgment still. He withheld them in mercy. What blessing would there have been in the mere office if the grace of the office were gone? What the use of Apostles if they were to be mere sharers of helplessness and misery for 1,800 years? How aggravated would have been our sin if Apostles had remained, only to be constantly and advisedly set at nought! How severe our chastisement if the fulness of Apostolic power had continued in such a Church as we have been, only to be prostituted to worldly ends, or to smite the disobedient with continual judgments from the Lord!

V.—RESTORATION.

V. But if the Church, though judged, is not forsaken, how is she to be holpen? how shall we have Apostolic times again? Only by having Apostolic men. And if these men are not really Apostles, the times will not be really Apostolic. The office must create the condition. The ordinance for unity, power, and holiness must constitute

these things. The government must fashion the kingdom, and not be fashioned by it. The primitive estate of the Church—so lauded by idolaters of the past, so longed for by lamenters of the present—owed its being to living Apostles, and its only value to their then recent traditions. That period of history cannot be recalled. It is gone, and here we are. The purpose of God points forward—not backward. The problem is not, how shall we retreat into the womb of the second century; but how shall we now act, being born? Not, how shall we ape our fathers, or reach the measure in which they fulfilled the purpose which God appointed them to fulfil; but how shall we now fulfil the purpose which God appoints us to fulfil? For the solution of this problem we must indeed go back; for Christianity cannot change—there can be no new religion, or new God. But we must go back, not in the order of *centuries*, but in the order of *grace*. We must ascend, not to any favourite point in ecclesiastical history, be it the sixteenth, the fourth, or the first century, but to our ascended Lord Himself, to draw both the pattern and the power from Him. We must not despise any past token of His presence, or expression of His truth, during those ages in which He has continued with us, though His face has been hidden. We must reverently acknowledge them all, and scrupulously steer our course by them. But we must subordinate them all to Himself, and believe that He is with us now for our work, as He was with our fathers for their's. Immanuel must be our watch-word—God with us.

It is no contradiction to say that it has been the will of God (who sees the end from the beginning) both to *continue* and to *restore* the Apostolic office—the one in His wisdom, the other in His pity—the one, if the Church would allow Him to preserve her from ruin, the other in answer to her cry when ruined. Of the one, the dogmatic and historic Scriptures inform us—of the other, the prophetic. The laws of God presuppose that we are a faithful people. But His promises, although fulfilled to the faithful alone, are addressed to His people in all the conditions in which He beholds, them and are not merely for the establishment, but for the awakening, of faith, and for the help of the returning sinner. While the Church is content without Apostles, and is conscious of no sin in regard to them, they would be useless to her. Did God thus give them again, He would only minister to the continuance of her sin and self-satisfaction; but whenever with penitence she again

seeks her perfection, God will give them again. Their proper work is once more presented to their hands.

Yet how shall they be given? Apostles cannot spiritually propagate Apostles. While alive, they can temporarily delegate certain of their powers—as we see in regard to Timothy and Titus; they can also make provision for the event of their death: but they cannot bequeath their Apostolic office. Successors of Apostles are indeed their successors in point of fact, and, through God's great and abnormal mercy, they may be able to impart a limited measure of Apostolic blessing; but Apostles they neither are nor can be. Apostles are neither of men nor by man. They alone are set over the whole Church; they cannot appoint one another. And if so, how can inferior ministers appoint them, or the whole Church create them? How can the Church set them over herself? So much for her right, but what of her capacity? Her ignorance of that office which lies at her foundation (Eph. ii. 20) is such that, were she to ask for it, she would not know for what she had asked. Its restoration, though no marvel in the eyes of the Lord (Zech. viii. 6), would be incredible in her's. The bearer of the tidings, instead of being hailed as a messenger of mercy, would be denounced as a heretic or confined as a madman. Apostles themselves would probably be put down by the usurpers of their place, and rejected by the rejecters of their power. And how shall the testimony of Jesus come, to indicate whom He will use as Apostles, when he who should speak by the Spirit of prophecy would be silenced as a brawler? Jesus is in the midst of His people as a mighty man that cannot save. Shall Apostles arise in the bosom of a sect to justify *it* against all others, and be called *its* Apostles? Shall they erect themselves, in disobedience, against the divine ordinances that are? How are gifts and ordinances to come without previous Apostles, or Apostles without previous gifts and ordinances? These, and many such questions, practically incapable of solution by man, are necessary conditions of the great problem. None but God can solve the questions and meet the conditions. And this He has begun to do—not by theoretical instruction, but by the actual exercise of His power. He has come among us, and with great might succoured us. His arm hath awaked as in the days of old. He hath arisen to lead the blind by a way that they knew not.

The narrative of this wonderful dealing is elsewhere to be found. We have here to do with the nature of the work

done and to be done by Apostles ; and, instead of asking what they have to do, one may rather ask, what have they not to do? As in the beginning the earth was without form and void, so is it now with the Church, as foreseen by Jeremiah. (Jer. iv. 23.) The only difference is this, that the former was seen in the natural, the latter in the spiritual ; and that, while the former state was the precursor of blessing and order, the latter is the result of their banishment and forfeiture. But shall there not be blessing and order again? Shall not new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness, wherein Jerusalem shall be a rejoicing and her people a joy, be seen, first in the mystery and then in revelation? (2 Pet. iii. 13 ; Isa. lxxv. 17 ; lxxvi. 22.) Who shall create these but God? Saith He not, "which I create"? And how shall He create them, but by the unchangeable ordinances of His unchangeable Christ? The twelve Apostles in the beginning, while they themselves were alive and in active operation, and when Peter had already opened the door to the Gentiles, had a much more plausible ground for saying that there was no proper work for Paul at all adequate to justify so strange and unscriptural an addition to their sacred number, than we can have for saying that the work of departed Apostles and the present state of Christendom leave nothing now for Apostles to do. There is everything to do, everything to restore, and then perfection as the goal.

Two facts are clear: 1st. The first Apostles did not finish their own proper work ; and, though they had, they did not finish the whole work of Apostles. 2nd. The work done by the first Apostles has been all but totally destroyed.

Let us take up the work at the death of the Twelve and of Paul. God had closed the destiny of the Jews, not for rejecting Christ in person, but for rejecting the Holy Ghost and the ministry of Christ. (Acts iii. 26 ; xiii. 46 ; Matt. xii. 32.) He had turned to the Gentiles, not to convert the whole, but to take out of them a people for His name (Acts xv. 14), called the fulness of the Gentiles—that part of the body and fulness of Christ which was to be composed of Gentile converts in the room of the recusant Jews. (Rom. xi. 25.) That was the work in hand. But the Apostles to the circumcision did not finish the work of filling up the body of Christ from the Gentiles. Peter spake of his own death, not of the completion of the Church. (2 Pet. i. 14.) John had much to say to the Church, but said it not. (3 John 13.) And those Apostles could not

possibly have finished that work, for they had expressly devolved it on Paul and Barnabas. (Gal. ii. 9.) But Paul and Barnabas did not finish it. Paul was bound at Jerusalem, and being delivered captive to the Gentiles, was both actually stopped in his work, and set as a sign of a quenched Apostleship. (Acts xxi. 11.) He called himself the Lord's prisoner for the Gentiles. (Eph. iii. 1 ; iv. 1 ; vi. 29 ; 2 Tim. i. 8 ; ii. 9 ; Philem. i.) He beseeched the Colossians to remember his bonds. (Col. iv. 18.) He had failed with the Galatians (Gal. iii.), and no less with the Corinthians, enriched though the latter had been in all knowledge and utterance. (1 Cor. xi. 34 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 3—10.) In writing to the Hebrews, he was obliged to keep back the very things by which alone the Church could be brought to perfection. (Heb. v. 11 ; ix. 5 ; xiii. 19.) Who has since revealed them ? Who have since heard them ? His directions to Timothy and Titus, which many regard as the perfect type of Church government under an episcopal Apostolate, are in part indeed directions for the delegates of living Apostles ; but when these directions regard the future, they are, like Acts xx., only the scheme of such a provisional guidance as was possible in the absence of Apostles. They even point to the restoration of Apostles as the only right scheme—the only hope to perfection. (1 Tim. iv. 14.) In speaking of his own office, Paul calls himself one born out of due time—not *behind* the time, but *before* it. (1 Cor. xv. 8.) He speaks of himself, not as an appendage or supplement of the Apostles to the circumcision, but as the embryo of Apostleship to the Gentiles, as one whose office was yet in part undeveloped, whose chief work was future. He alone saw the Lord after, by His ascension, He had actually entered into that glory which He now has with the Father—that glory in which He prophetically appeared on the mount of transfiguration, to strengthen the Apostles in temptation—that glory in which He shall come again to receive His bride from Apostles. Peter, James, and John were the chosen three who witnessed the raising of Jairus's daughter, the transfiguration, and the agony—the pillars who received Paul at Jerusalem ; John received the Revelation of Jesus Christ ; but Paul alone was caught up into the third heavens. Peter, James, and John saw the Lord in His future glory ; but Paul saw Him in His present glory. He then saw the things unutterable which are reserved for those who love God and wait for His Son from Heaven. Till these things

come, the work of Apostles is not done. And the invincible reason for believing that their work is unfinished is this, that the finishing of that work and the coming of Christ's kingdom are one and the same thing. There will be no waiting for the kingdom after the Church is prepared for it. The Bridegroom waits till the bride be ready. (Rev. xix. 7.) The converse is not true. And if the work of Apostles is to prepare the bride, and that work has been long since finished, either the fanatics are right, who say that the kingdom is come—that the resurrection and translation are past; or else the blasphemers, who say that the Lord has forgotten His people.

The special work, then, which Paul so mightily began, is now to be completed by a twelvefold Apostleship, of which he was but the first-fruits and embryo, and with which the restoration of all other divine ministries, in their proper form and measure, is inseparably connected. But if this is clear, from an examination of the scriptural nature of the Apostolic office, and the history of its operation, we find the same no less clearly indicated in every various form of doctrine, action, type, and promise, throughout the whole Scriptures. Some of these indications we shall now select—first from the New Testament, then from the Old.

1. Our Lord, when about to go to the Father, leaving His disciples in the world, prayed that during His absence they and all who believed their word might be one, as He and the Father were. (John xvii. 13, 21). That prayer is yet unanswered. Yet it cannot go unanswered, and it must be answered in this dispensation. How can it be answered, save by restoring that ordinance for unity for which He prayed, not "Take it away," but "Keep it from evil"?

2. Our blessed Lord, although ever perfect in holiness, did not become perfect in office till His resurrection and ascension. (Heb. v. 9.) That is, He did not, as the Man Christ Jesus, attain to that immortality, victory, glory, unction, and power by which He was to become the perfectly saved One and the perfect Saviour, until He ascended to God. On the cross He ransomed us from death; but the Church, like the Holy Ghost who dwells in her, has her mission from Him, not on the cross, but on the right hand of power. From that His perfection, as the *personal* Christ, she starts, in order that she may attain the same, and so perfect the *mystical* Christ. She does not earn that position as the reward of her own efforts; it is her birth-right. In going on to perfection, she only obtains her birth-right.

(Heb. vi. 1.) All those who believe in and assume the place, privilege, victory, and power into which we are introduced by being in Him who is risen, these are the perfect in Christ—these are of full age. (1 Cor. ii. 6; Col. i. 28; Heb. v. 14.) But those who linger among the beginnings of the doctrine of Christ, fail of that perfection, being blind to their true calling and position. The Church as a body has become so. Yet we have the promise of God that she shall attain perfection; and that must be through the sending of Apostles from Him who is perfected.

3. Our Lord in the days of His flesh was the sacrificial Lamb—the amnos (John i. 29); but in His glorified state He is the arnion, the Son of Man, the perfected Saviour, the future Judge (Rev. vi. 16; vii. 17; xiv. 1). When, after His resurrection (John xxi. 15,) He gave Peter his charge, he prophesied therein the gradual declension of the Church. He said first, “Feed, boske those that are perfect”—not probata, but arnia—who stand fast in their head—who are seated with Him in heavenly places, and need only feeding. Then, “Poimane ta probata mou, rule my sheep or flock”—the highest standing gone, the mere government of those in the lower position remaining. Lastly, “Feed my sheep”—the mere preservation of life—both standing and government gone. Compare this with Rev. xiv. 1—4—the vision of 144,000 standing with the Lamb on Mount Zion and following Him whithersoever He goeth; and we see that at the end we shall again know Christ as the arnion—the perfect one—and shall thus ourselves be perfect in Him. But this can only be through Apostles—the appointed witnesses to Christ as the arnion or perfect one—witnesses not in word only, but in deed.

4. The Church was at the first sealed with the Holy Ghost (2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30), as the earnest of our inheritance, by the laying on of Apostles’ hands; but we hear nothing more of this sealing till the end of the dispensation. The angel comes up from the east with the seal of the living God, to seal His servants in their foreheads. (Rev. vii. 2.) Till this is done, the judgment is stayed. The number sealed is the same as that of the 144,000 who stand on Mount Zion. And of the latter it is said that they have the name of the Father of the Lamb written on their foreheads. This is the seal of their adoption in the Son (Rev. xiv. 1); this is the antitype of that mark, set upon the foreheads of the mourners, which saved them from the slaughter, mentioned in Ezekiel ix., even as the blood of

the Paschal Lamb saved the houses of Israel in Egypt. This seal, therefore, is a name. The seal of the living God is a living seal. The living seal is the Holy Ghost, by whom the Father and the Son make their abode with us. And the Holy Ghost is given by the hands of Apostles. Sealed by Apostles, the Church is, at the first, sent into the world to fight the fight of faith; sealed by Apostles, the Church, long vanquished and captive, at length overcomes, and is, at the last, taken out of the world from the great tribulation, and so prepared to come with Christ. Thus shall Zion bring forth *before* she travails.

5. Although our Lord did not say that John should tarry till He come, He did say, "If I will," &c. John was the last of the Apostles, and received that Revelation which closed the canon. The tradition concerning his re-appearance has taken many forms, and points to the faith lurking in the Church that Apostleship is not extinct—that we have the remnants of the first and the embryo of the last—that a John shall be present when Jesus comes—that Apostles, as they who saw Him depart, shall also receive Him again—and that the Church, which had Apostles when He left her, shall have them when He returns. (Acts i.; John xxi. 21.)

6. In Rev. iv. 4, we have a vision of the Church and its ministries in their perfect form. There the government of Christ is shared, not by twelve, but by twenty-four; by which is meant, not twenty-four men by name, but a duplicate of the Apostolic office, which, as we know from all Scripture, ought to be fulfilled by twelve, although it can stand in fewer. Jesus chose twelve; the patriarchs, the princes, the spies, were all twelve; the tribes were twelve; the foundations of the city are twelve; the fruits of the tree of life, twelve. And the hours of the day, the months of the year, the signs of the zodiac, bearing reference to Christ as the light of the world and the sun of righteousness, are all twelve. Yet Jesus expounded to two Apostles; He prophesied to seven; He spoke of eleven when eleven were not present, and of twelve when there existed only eleven. And if an Apostle prove faithless, the corporate power remains with the faithful, however their action may be crippled by his absence. Still, twelve is the ordinance of God: not twelve separate governments, more or less alike and united, but the exercise of one government through twelve. The Apostolic office shall be seen, as at the beginning, so at the end, expressing Christ

as Alpha and Omega, shutting up the whole dispensation as a unity. On the other hand, we see but twelve stars, not twenty-four, on the head of the woman (Rev. xii. 1), because the truth there expressed is not the constitution of the Apostolic office as a whole, but its recovery at the time of the end, as the means of strengthening the woman to bring forth—the restoration, not of Urim and Thummim, as under the law, but of Thummim and Urim; apostles first, prophets second, to God's Holy One.

7. In Rev. xviii. 20, the holy apostles and prophets are called on to rejoice over Babylon, because God hath avenged them upon her, or executed their sentence against her. This Babylon is spiritual, for the literal did not then exist. It is Christendom, become the city of confusion and captivity. The apostles and prophets are not to be disjoined. They are not prophets and apostles—Old Testament prophets and New Testament apostles—but apostles and prophets who unite in one denunciation. Neither are they the apostles and prophets at the beginning, to whom Eph. ii. 20 is usually confined, because those apostles and prophets did not denounce Babylon, are not assailed by her, and are not present to rejoice over her. If there shall be a real, though spiritual, Babylon, there must be real apostles and prophets to rejoice over her fall. And why? Because apostles and prophets build the Church according to the will and way of God, as contrasted with the will and way of man. This building of the Church in the midst of confusion will be the practical test by which the apostasy of Babylon will be disclosed. Of this Zechariah informs us in the vision of the flying roll which had the measures of the holy place in the tabernacle. (Zech. v.) This work of God will both call forth the anger of Babylon and justify her judgment, because she rejects the true foundation which apostles and prophets afford. Moreover, their re-appearance at the end is the proof that the commendation of the angel of Ephesus was not undeserved. It shall be the signal for the appearance of Satan's counterfeits. (2 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xiii. 14.)

8. The folly of the five virgins in the parable (Matt. xxv.) was seen in their want, not of lamps, but of oil. Such has been the position of the most faithful in the Church for 1,800 years—endeavouring to maintain the testimony for the truth without the supply of the Spirit. This oil is not to be found by chance; there are those whose business is to sell it; and they are Apostles.

9. Isaiah promises to Zion that God will make her a city

of righteousness, the faithful city, by giving her her judges as at the first and her counsellors as at the beginning. (Isa. i. 26.) The restoration of the original ordinances are the means of perfecting the Church. And in Isaiah xl. we have the development of the same promise, the gift of the Comforter by Apostles (v. 1), the voice of the prophet (v. 6), the message of the evangelist (v. 9), the care of the shepherd (v. 11).

10. In Zech. i., the horns of the Gentiles are those corrupted and fleshly forms of God's ministries by which the Church has been destroyed. The four carpenters are those ministries purified and fulfilled in the Spirit, by which this destruction shall be repaired, and the tabernacle of God, which shall be with men, shall be built. The prophecies of Joel as to the locust, palmer worm, &c., are to the same effect.

11. In Zech. x. the early and latter rains are promised, the same as those of which James speaks at chap. v. The husbandman is Christ; the soil, the Church; the year's tillage, the Christian dispensation; the early rain, the outpouring of the Spirit at the beginning, which caused the seed to spring; the latter rain, that at the end (no new Pentecost, but the fulfilment of the first), by which the ear is filled for harvest, and the tares which will not be filled are detected. Now is the harvest at hand. If the early rain came by Apostles, so must the latter.

12. The same prophet, after giving the vision of the perfect Church, as of a candlestick with the two golden pipes, apostles and prophets, tells us at chap. iv., first, that God's work is performed not by might nor by power, but by the Spirit; second, that this work is to bring forth the head-stone; third, that He who laid the foundation shall finish; and, fourth, that the work shall be despised. Joshua, as we see at chap. iii., represents the priesthood which receives change of raiment: Zerubbabel, the ruler. The Apostolic work in perfecting the Church shall be despised now by Gentiles, as formerly by Jews. Its power shall be in the Holy Ghost. Its object is to proclaim the session of Christ at God's right hand, and to prepare His return. It constituted the Church at the first, and it shall perfect her at the last.

13. The prophet Amos (ix. 13) promises that the ploughman shall overtake the reaper. As we read in the Psalms, that those who sow in tears shall reap with joy (Ps. cxxvi.), so does our Lord tell us that he that reapeth receiveth wages

and gathereth fruit unto eternal life, that both the sower and reaper may rejoice together. He also tells us that we enter into the labour of others. (John iv. 36, 38.) The year, the crop, the culture, the husbandman, are one. But the labour varies with the season. The sowing and reaping, although parts of one culture, are yet diverse. The reaper enters into the labours of the sower; so did the first Apostles into those of the patriarchs—so do we into the labours of the first Apostles. The sower begins the culture; the reaper receives the reward; yet he shares it with the sower. The Apostles at the first and those at the last shall not strive for pre-eminence. The former shall not boast of their labour, nor the latter of their reward; for one Lord has wrought by both. The twenty-four elders shall sit together.

14. Joel prophesied that in the last days God would pour out His Spirit. This came to pass at Pentecost (Acts ii. 17), but it was not then finished. The last days are the whole Christian dispensation, as distinguished from its predecessors. (Heb. i. 2.) John even calls it the last hour. (1 John ii. 18.) If we were forced to choose between the beginning and the end thereof, we should call the end the last days of Joel; for so do the Scriptures, contrasting it with the beginning. (2 Tim. iii. 1; James v. 3; Jude 18; 1 Pet. i. 5, 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3.) We admit, however, that the term applies to the whole dispensation; yet we maintain that, as Pentecost was only the beginning of the dispensation, the pouring out of the Spirit then was not the completion, but the introduction, of a work; and that the constant pouring out of the Spirit through Apostles is the fulfilment of Joel's words. Now, if the conflict at the end is to be the sharpest, the armour must be the best. We must expect the largest effusion of the Spirit, and that must come by Apostles.

15. In the wilderness, the manna was found as the consequence of the dew. The dew typifies the descent of the Spirit, the manna the presence of Christ by the Spirit. On the sixth day, preceding the seventh, twice as much fell as usual. This typifies an extraordinary presence of Christ before the end, by the pouring out of the Spirit through Apostles.

16. When the Jews returned from captivity, and the question of genealogies was mooted, it was decided that certain claims should be postponed until a priest should arise with Urim and Thummim. Now is the time when God will bring everything to light; and although Episcopal ordination and Apostolic succession, as mere historical

deductions or external forms, have, like the genealogies in 1 Tim. i. 4, occupied and partly satisfied the minds of men, God will now inquire for a true and present genealogy. He will judge between the fit and the unfit; He will determine who shall be held worthy to serve Him at His restored altar. The former imperfect modes of call and ordination shall give place to the perfect.

17. In the history of Eli and Samuel, Eli represents the ancient institutions of the Church, venerable and true, but worn out, and unable to correct the wickedness of her present administration, represented by Hophni and Phinehas. (1 Kings i., &c.) God resolves to change the priesthood; He raises up Samuel, born in answer to faith, the son of a barren but sorrowful mother, trained in the house of the Lord, obedient to and recognized by Eli. Eli shares the fate of his progeny, while Samuel takes the rule. Samuel is the Apostleship of the last days—purposed by God, yet unwillingly supplanting the existing order of things.

18. Saul was the king given in wrath, because the Jews desired to be ruled like the nations, and yet appointed as God's channel of blessing to those under his rule—a type of the hierarchy in Christendom, fashioned in imitation of, and claiming a place among, the powers of the world, yet recognized of God in the absence of a better. David—by birth unknown, yet of royal extraction, without ambition, fearing and honouring Saul, persecuted by him, hidden among his foes, yet sparing and rescuing the life of his persecutor, and mourning his death, punishing his destroyers, and cherishing his seed—is the type of the true hierarchy, according to God's heart, which shall do all His pleasure—the saviour from ruin, not the cause of it.

19. Elias represents the testimony for God and His coming kingdom in the midst of apostasy, preserved from famine, and shielded from the rage of wicked authority in Jezebel and Ahab. The question, whether he or the prophets were of God, was tried by the acceptance or rejection of their offerings, as in the case of Aaron's rod; and the divine recognition of Elias by that acceptance was the warrant for judgment. His work was to prove (1) that there was a living God, (2) that he served that God, (3) that he served Him aright; and his object in so doing was, not to justify himself or injure others, but to turn the hearts of His people to their God. And what course did he pursue? He built no new altar after a new fashion, but repaired the fallen altar of the Lord with twelve stones, according to the

names of the children of Israel; and on that altar, surrounded with water, he offered a bullock to the Lord. (1 Kings xviii. 30—36.) This offering God accepted by fire; and on their want of acceptance Elias judged his rivals. So is it now. The poor widow has kept alive the truth. The power of the unfaithful Church, Jezebel, and of her husband, the State, has not succeeded in destroying it. Although secretly acknowledged by Obadiah, the faithful remnant of the priests yet existing, it stands in irreconcilable contradiction to the whole system of things. The decision must come, whether God's word or man's word be true; and that by proving whether God's work or man's shall stand. The restoration of God's true worship by a faithful priesthood, in a church filled with the Holy Ghost, and blessed through a fourfold ministry, founded on the Apostles of the risen Lord, keeping the faith delivered to the saints and the ordinances given at the first,—this will, like the flying roll of Zechariah, cut off on the right and on the left everything that is not of God. God will prove that He liveth. He will acknowledge His servants. They shall be seen keeping all His charge. The heart of His people shall be turned unto Him once more. He will be proved the righteous judge on Babylon.

20. But the work of Elias does not end here. Malachi declares that God will send the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the Lord, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and of the children to their fathers, lest He smite the earth with a curse. (Malachi iv.) Elijah is the witness, not only for the existing truth, but for the coming salvation. That salvation began in the person of Jesus Christ, and shall be completed in His perfected body. He was indeed Immanuel. But the full mystery of Immanuel is not seen till He is seen with His perfected body, the Church—one Christ. As, therefore, the personal Jesus did not exhaust the promise of Immanuel, so did His personal forerunner, John, not exhaust the promise of Elijah. Elias shall yet come to restore all things, bringing God's order out of man's confusion. The great and dreadful day is yet future. The curse which would devour the earth is yet future. Its prevention is indeed certain (for the earth is Christ's inheritance), but it is future, and conditioned on this work of Elias. Apostles (the Fathers) must yet appear, loving the children of God in the bowels of Christ, calling them beloved and longed for in truth. A people must yet be seen loving and obeying Apostles for Jesus' sake, bound

like a sacrifice to the horns of the altar, walking with God, and ready to be taken by Christ to Himself.

21. But, in the last place, the history of Moses and Joshua affords light on this subject, in three different aspects. In one, confining our view to the acts of Moses, his first reception of the tables from the hand of God typifies the giving of God's law to the Church at first; their destruction, the subsequent corruption of the Church in whose heart the law was written; and the restoration of the tables, the restoration of the Church, as the depository of God's law, by the same hands which wrote that law in her at the first, when the Church shall repent of and confess her sins. In another, confining our view to the wilderness time, Moses is the type of Christ's Apostleship, by which, being delivered from the Egyptian bondage of the flesh, we are to be brought through the wilderness of this world into the land of promise, the kingdom to come. (Psalm lxxviii. 54.) The march through the desert is the Christian dispensation. The people provoked God. Moses failed to bring them in. They wandered about and died. But when they were without help, eating the bitter fruit of their ways, God raised up Joshua to execute the unfulfilled commission of Moses. He published no new law, he exercised no new power, he sought no new inheritance; but he circumcised the people afresh. He gave that charge to the people which he had received from Moses. He was received as their deliverer divinely commissioned in Moses' stead; and he did deliver them. He brought them into the land which God had sworn to their fathers, to give it them. The sun and the moon stood still on their behalf. Jordan could not stop them. And so with Apostles now. The Church has provoked God. The work of the first Apostles has been interrupted; the people of God wander and perish in the uncircumcision of their heart. But God raises up Apostles again, and binds them up with the former in one office. They shall again bring the Church to walk in the Spirit. But they bring no novelties. They go back upon the ancient commission and power, upon the ancient faith; and they lead into the kingdom promised of old. They revive the Apostolic rule, and the ministration of the Spirit. They are received as deliverers. The providence of God favours their labours. The wheels move with the cherubim. And at length they obtain the victory over death, in the resurrection of those that sleep, and the translation of those that are alive and remain. In the third aspect, extending our view

from the appearance of Moses to that of Christ, the entrance into the promised land is the type, not of the attainment of the kingdom, but of the constitution of the Church as she has been hitherto in the world. And Joshua, the successor of Moses, who received the charge of the people on the death of the true lawgiver, is to be regarded as the type of Apostolical episcopacy, the memory or remnants of which fail to keep the people in the right way, until Christ, the true Moses, appears again to fulfil the law and the prophets, to establish His kingdom.

VI.—CREDENTIALS.

VI. It now only remains to inquire into the credentials of Apostles at the end of the Christian dispensation.

According to the way of man, those are held to be the best judges of divine credentials who are most impartial. In one sense this is true, in another false. Those are, indeed, most likely to acknowledge the truth of God whose only desire is to know it, whose eye is single; but the question is, What is the best attitude in which to recognize the truth? The answer is, Not the neutral position of an unconcerned or ignorant observer, but the position of one trained to know truth. We cannot accept or reject God's truth as we please. We must be educated in the truth; else we have no power to acknowledge it. Jesus showed Himself after His resurrection to chosen witnesses. He selected those men to bear testimony to His resurrection whom men would call the most partial witnesses. And why? Because they had been with Him from the beginning. Those, therefore, can best judge of the credentials of Apostles who have marked their progress, who have grown with them, who have shared their education. The Church, as a whole, has been found by God in utter ignorance, weakness, and error. Apostles who should betray in themselves no traces of these, would be a monstrous birth. That very fact would be proof against them. If they are to save the Church, they must be saved *with* the Church. They must grow from ignorance and weakness into knowledge and power. The righteous falleth seven times and riseth again. It must be seen, not that they are infallible, but that the infallible God is their guide to that infallibility which is the prerogative of the whole Church, abiding in Christ, and in which alone it can be said of Apostles that what they bind and loose on earth is bound and loosed in Heaven. And

unless the Church help them by her counsel, faith, and obedience, this point they never can attain.

The way of faith is to believe a witness. The way of unbelief is to demand a proof; to believe no man, unless one has other evidence than his. "Blessed are they which have not seen, and yet have believed." Yet in a matter of such momentous importance—when either the greatest salvation or the greatest delusion is presented to us, and at a time when we are to expect false Apostles, in every form, political, social, and religious—it is not unreasonable to demand credentials of the true.

But what credentials? Credentials to faith, not to unbelief. Paul expressly distinguishes between his offices as preacher and as Apostle. (1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11.) He does indeed say (2 Cor. xii. 12) that in his case the signs of an Apostle were wrought among the Corinthians with signs and wonders and mighty deeds. But if we compare this with Rom. xv. 19, we see that it was for their conversion as heathen. Where Apostles acted as evangelists, the sign followed the word. But the present question regards the Church. What are credentials to the Church? Apostles in this respect are like every other ordinance of God, and their restoration is like every other work of God. God sends them to the faithful; He never will send them to unbelievers. He does not ask the obedience of unbelief; He has no Apostolic credentials for it. Therefore are Apostles a sign to this generation, proving its unbelief by their rejection at the hands of those who count themselves, and should be, spiritual and able to judge. As long as the Church is in her present condition, it is worse than idle to expect her recognition of Apostles. Human ordinances the flesh can acknowledge, but it cannot recognize divine. Apostles whom most Christians in their present state would recognize, must be false. Ecclesiastical heads set up by man, or setting up themselves—shepherds that are dumb dogs, who clothe themselves with the wool and love not the sheep—a people destitute of divine ordinances or corrupted by their abuse—Christians who neither know their standing, nor honour their privileges, nor use their power, but disown, condemn, and abuse them—men baptized into Christ, who only exceed the heathen in power to devise and do iniquity—professed worshippers of God, who worship every idol, yea, the works of their own hands instead, who make religion a science to be taught and learned by those that keep not the commandments of God, who, as gods, guide them—

selves and judge Almighty God Himself—a people whose heart is not right with God, who hunger and thirst not for righteousness, who wait not for the Son of Man from Heaven, who satisfy their cravings in their own way, who do His work by their own devices, who, instead of realizing the mystery of godliness, fashion godliness, but deny its power, and turn it into gain—a people lost in darkness, steeped in heresy, proud of schism, who have forgotten the first principles of Christ, emptied His sacraments, and broken all His bands, who trample on the faith of their fathers, and are puffed up for new gods—a people which knows not how to try the spirits, whether they be of God, yea, believes no longer in spirits at all—a people which neither knows what Apostles are, nor believes that they should be, nor seeks them again, which has lost all faith that Christ liveth to act by men and to fill all in all, and has lost all power to know His voice and His hand—an adulterous generation which seeketh a sign, through lack of faith and of fellowship with God,—such can never believe the credentials of Apostles. To such no credentials shall be offered, save in judgment. They shall have no sign but that of the prophet Jonas—a body, dead with Christ and alive unto God, which they cannot see—a spiritual work for which they have no spiritual sense. When they seek David, they shall find but the pillow. (1 Sam. xix. 13.) They shall grope in vain for the messengers whom, like the men of Sodom, they seek to know. (Gen. xix. 11.) If they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe though one rose from the dead. To a people which neither knows God's will nor hears His word, all the proofs of Apostleship are in vain. But to those who love God Himself and all who bear His holy name in baptism—who keep His commandments and wait for His salvation—who honour the faith and works, but do not, like the Pharisees, boast of their fathers—who believe that Christ liveth, and that His grace faileth not, and that His ways do not change—whose tears are registered in Heaven, whose prayers and alms come up in remembrance before God,—to them are the credentials given, to them they suffice. These God visits; their hearts He prepares. “My sheep hear my voice.” He that believeth hath the witness in himself. (1 John v. 10.) We have received the Spirit which is of God, that we may know the things that are freely given to us of God. Spiritual persons know spiritual things. (1 Cor. ii. 12, 14.) When God gave a sign to Moses, it was to strengthen faith (Exod. iii. 12); when Christ appeared

to Paul, it was for his conviction, that he might obey the call of God. (Acts ix. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 1.) But as of old the Jews did not know what the manna was, so is it now with that presence of Christ in His Church—Immanuel—the spiritual sign given through Apostles—which God's people do not know, which the flesh cannot apprehend. (2 Cor. iii. 3.)

But who shall try the credentials of Apostles? If we are isolated persons, each can hear and judge and act for himself; but if we are one body—not as a figure, but as a fact—the body must hear and fulfil the words of Christ by its appointed organs. Herein lies the true communion of saints. That which the appointed organ does is done by all and for all, and can be done by none else. Although every one of us shall give an account of himself to God, neither his own conscience nor his own judgment is his God. That each individual shall arrogate to himself to try Apostles, to try the spirits, or to fulfil any other command given in the Bible to the whole Church, is out of the question. As Apostles dispense one Spirit and one law to the whole Church, so are angels or bishops—in short, the heads of all particular bodies—bound to receive this Apostolic dispensation. Therefore are they bound and empowered to see that no forgery is practised by the Devil. It is the angel at Ephesus who is commended for trying false Apostles—probably men who could show the credential, usually sought for, of having seen the Lord, as they say. He was helped by the faith of his Church, he stood at the head of a faithful body, but he alone had the charge of the trial. Now, in order to make such a trial, the head of a church must be such as the angel of Ephesus. And what was his first qualification? That he received and obeyed a true Apostle. A church which either rejected John, or stood without him, or was deprived of his support, could never have tried false Apostles. The Apostle is the right hand of Christ; the angel is the star which it holds fast in its place. Let the star fall out of the hand, and its light is gone—yea, it turns to darkness. But where is the church now like Ephesus, or the bishop like its angel? The parallel cannot hold. What God in His great and wonderful pity has done, in standing by the poorest remnant of His ordinances, and honouring the least fidelity to Him, the least care for His poor sheep, is another matter. We dare not take it as the rule of His procedure. We speak of His appointed way; and we maintain that a church or minister, neither in obedience to and upheld by living and true

Apostles, nor at least recognizing the value and desiring the restoration of true Apostles, has neither full right nor full power to try the false ; and that any who reject true Apostleship, and yet make the trial, will fail and be deceived.

The Apostles whom the Lord giveth have shared the sin and sorrow of the Church. They have been bred in her bosom. They have appeared there, where truth and liberty are most combined—not truth without liberty, nor liberty without truth. They have not raised themselves up. They have been called of God, not by fanatical internal persuasion, but by an external act of the Holy Ghost—not in a secret chamber, but in the midst of those who believed that Apostles should be. They have not rushed into their functions in ignorant haste and self-will, but have been gradually, often unwillingly, introduced to them. They have been publicly recognized, by a corporate act of the churches, as the men whom God would use. They have been liberated from all inferior authority, and separated to their work by a solemn transaction. In that position, they have been continually presented by the Church as a wave sheaf to the Lord, that He may accept, empower, and use them. They have started with no perfect system of their own. They have learned together out of His Word, and received the light of His prophets and the help of all His other ministers—yea, of all His people. In their untried circumstances, they have waited for the sanction of His word, and the signs of His providence. In the midst of weakness, through errors manifold, in spite of increasing temptations, they have gone forward. By nothing less than a constant miracle have they been preserved. They boast not themselves ; they preach not themselves. They make common cause with the weakest. They are accredited by others. They are empowered to govern and bless, as far as God's children can bear it. They astonish none by miracles—entice none, by flatteries, to follow them—covet not numbers of men or masses of flesh—pander to no lusts—use no stratagems or strokes of policy—seek not to regain for the Church the favour of the world. As the foundations, they are unseen and despised ; and are content to be so, provided the building be reared, leaving it to the day to declare their work. (Cor. iv. 9.) They are as the weakness of God, which is stronger than man. "John did no miracle" (John x. 41), but he laboured to reform his people. He pointed to the Saviour ; and all that he said of Christ was true.

Paul wrote to the Corinthians : "Am I not an Apostle ? Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord ? Are not ye my

work in the Lord?" (1 Cor. ix. 1.) This was his apology. He asserted the fact of his Apostleship; he maintained that he had received neither commission nor direction from man—that he was free from all inferior authority, in order to rule in the fear of the Lord and the unity of Apostleship. He narrated the mode of Christ's dealing with him; he stated what He had done. The same are the credentials of Apostles now. They can assert their office. They have been called by prophecy, but they are Apostles by the Lord. They do not merely refer to a past event—they state a fact. They can narrate the mode of their preparation for office. They are in their office; and they can show their work.

To what work shall they point? To the churches which they build, order, and bless; to the catholicity of the same, whether seen in ten or in a thousand; to the holiness of their lives; to the loyalty of their politics; to the order of their houses and affairs; to their deep knowledge and right use of the Scriptures; to the pregnant fulness, dignity, sincerity, and joy of their worship; to the development of their ministries; to the abundance and comfort of their gifts; to the wisdom, power, and mercy of their discipline; to the mutual help of their members; to the constancy of their hope; to the truth, the power, the zeal, the patience, the charity of their testimony; to the heavenly temper of their armour, offensive and defensive; to the Satanic wiles which they detect; to the evils they mitigate and remove, and to the blessings they dispense; to their detection and resistance of Antichrist and preparation for Christ. This is the work—not a miracle or a make-believe, but a steady progress of cleansing, ordering, and blessing, through the energy of Christ, the purging of the floor by Him whose fan is in His hand, the discovery and abolition of sin, the true bearing of the cross in the hope of the crown. Every part of the work is a confession that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. (1 John iv. 2.) At all this the secure will smile, and the yet undetected Pharisee will point the finger, as they did who said, "He saved others—Himself He cannot save," or "What will these feeble Jews?" But we must bear the shame of having our state revealed, our provocations, inconsistencies, and falls. It is the yoke of the Lord, and He will justify those who bear it. In so far as God prevails to purify and guide us, in so far are we the seal of Apostleship; and He will perfect the seal. Apostles shall yet have their full credentials, for they shall have done their work.

The set time is come for God to remember Zion and to

build Jerusalem. The cry of the widow is heard by the righteous Judge; the fig-tree buddeth; Aaron's rod blossometh. Now is the ark a building; for, behold, the defences have fallen. There is no man more. The Lord's house is a den of thieves—Babylon inhabited of devils. The wicked gather; the name of the Lord is blasphemed; the religion of the man of sin prevails. Therefore does God send again Apostles, with prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. He has called, trained, separated, and sent them; allotted their labours, assigned their fellow-labourers, taught them their work, given them a pattern of His, and endowed them with His power. He sends them, not to innovate, but to restore; not to sow, but to reap; not to found, but to finish; not to gather, but to perfect; not to form the woman, but to be her crown; not to find the bride, but to bring her; not to wait for the Spirit, but to minister Him; to show both the Alpha and the Omega; to go forth from the risen Lord, and to receive Him again. They may not have gone over the cities of Israel before the Son of Man be come; but now they labour to save who will be saved—to present the remnant perfect unto Christ.



ON THE OFFICE OF THE PARACLETE

IN

THE PRAYERS OF THE CHURCH.

1853.

ON THE OFFICE OF THE PARACLETE

IN

THE PRAYERS OF THE CHURCH.

THE word Παράκλητος properly signifies a patron who comforts us by the access which, as intercessor, he has on our behalf to another.

It is the will of God that men should not be without such a paraclete. Such was our Lord Jesus while on earth (John xiv. 16)—such is He still at God's right hand (1 John ii. 1). And, in the strictest sense, He is the only Paraclete. But when He was about to leave this earth for a season, He promised to His disciples that the Father should give to them, at His request, another Paraclete, who should remain with them until the age (εις τον αιωνα) (John xiv. 16), and whose presence, being virtually His presence, and, by anticipation, His return, should prevent them from being orphans. Yet He vindicated the unity of the office as His own, though fulfilled through another person, by calling that other Paraclete the Holy Spirit, whom the Father should send in *His* name, whom *He* should send from the Father, and who should teach and bring to remembrance *His* words. (John xiv. 26 ; xv. 26.) And in saying, "He shall not come unto you except I go away," He showed that we cannot have two Paracletes at once. (John xvi. 7.) Therefore, while Christ is our only Paraclete, we have now with us a distinct Divine Person, whose functions, as Paraclete in His stead, are as real and as definite as His.

Moreover, our Lord describes the testimony given concerning Him, by the Spirit of truth who proceedeth from the Father, as a distinct thing from the testimony given concerning Him by His disciples who had been with Him from the beginning. (John xv. 26.) And Paul describes it not only as distinct from, but as added to, the testimony of those who have heard the Lord, in order to form the complement of theirs. This the word συνεπιμαρτυρουντος imports. (Heb. ii. 4.)

Further, Paul declares that the Holy Spirit not only enables us to cry "Abba, Father," but does Himself bear concurrent witness, with our spirit, that we are children of God. In other words, He not only, as the Spirit of adoption, Πνευμα υιοθεσιας, the Spirit by whom adoption is wrought, inspires us with faith in our adoption, but also bears witness that we are God's children, by doing those things for us which He does for God's children alone—i.e., by being the Paraclete to us. (Rom. viii. 16.)

The mission of Paul, as we learn from Romans xv. 16, was,* that he should be the Minister or Liturgist (λειτουργος) of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, transforming the Gospel of God into priestly service (ιερουρουντα το ευαγγελιον); in other words, building among them, by the Gospel, a temple for God, and changing them from being hearers of the Gospel to be worshippers of God, in order that the offering (προσφορα) of the Gentiles might become acceptable (ευπροσδεκτος), being sanctified in the Holy Ghost (ηγιασμενη εν Πνευματι αγιω)—i.e., in order that the Gentiles, who had till then brought unacceptable offerings, and had themselves been an unacceptable offering, might bring and be an acceptable offering, by that sanctification. The ground of this acceptance is not only faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, but being brought by that faith through holy baptism into a position in which the Holy Ghost can consecrate us to Christ, and through Him to God.

Now, in order to understand how this is done, we must rightly apprehend the new relations into which the Holy Spirit came through the incarnation, resurrection, and ascension of the Son.

Although the Son was from all eternity destined to be the Head of the Church, He did not become so at His incar-

* The Romans whom Paul addressed were a Church originally composed, and then mainly consisting, of Jews, whom he desired to teach how they should regard their Gentile brethren. They were the δυνατοι, the strong, who had to bear the infirmities of the αδυνατοι, the weak, that the οικοδομη, the building of the one house, might go forward among them, through the patience of the strong, as the bearers of Christ's reproach, with the weak, who brought the reproach, and through the comfort, παρακλησις, of the Comforter, who was to establish their unity in the Head. The Jews were the strong, by having already "received mercy" in that circumcision which only awaited its true fulfilment, and in those promises which only awaited their confirmation. The Gentiles were weak, by having only then "received mercy." Both were to be strong in joy, peace, and hope, through the power of one Spirit. And he rests his admonition on the fact that he was commissioned to make the Gentiles a covenant people, and worshippers in the Holy Ghost, as well as the Jews.

nation. The future King of the Jews was then born; but He did not then appear as king. The High Priest of the true tabernacle was then born; but He did not then appear as a priest. As long as He was on earth He neither was nor could be a priest. Till He commenced His public ministry, at thirty years of age, His whole life was no more than that of the righteous man and the faithful Jew—fulfilling every human obligation to God and man, and fulfilling all righteousness in the highest form in which man was then required to do so—namely, by the observance of the whole Jewish law. And when He commenced His public ministry, He did not cease to be under the Jewish law, but taught, by word and deed, its spiritual fulfilment.

At that age the Holy Spirit descended and abode upon Him, first, in testimony that He was the man in whom God was well pleased; second, as the answer of God to His great act of repentance in receiving the baptism of John; third, in order to furnish Him with the power to fulfil His ministry, active and passive; fourth, as the seal and pledge of that eternal life which He should, as man, inherit for us.

Previous to that time the Holy Ghost had acted in His incarnation and sanctification. But then the Spirit of God, the Spirit of the Father and the Son, became the Spirit of the Son in a new manner, as the Spirit of the Man Jesus Christ. In other words, the change wrought on the relations of the Son by His adoption of a created subsistence into His divine person, induced an analogous change in the relations of the Holy Spirit when He took His abode in the Son as man. The Holy Spirit neither did nor could become incarnate; and He did not, by dwelling in the Son, assume the place of the human spirit in man. But the Son, in becoming man, became capable of being His dwelling-place. In descending on the Son, the Holy Spirit found a dwelling-place in one who had become man, and thenceforward He was not only the Spirit of God, but also the Spirit of the Man Jesus Christ.

Thus He came into a condition in which He was capable of humiliation, suffering, and exaltation. He had not been changed into a creature, and, therefore, His humiliation was not that of a creature; nor was it that very humiliation which the Son underwent in becoming man; but it resulted from it, and was akin to it. He did not die when Christ died, but He was humbled and suffered as the Spirit of Him who died. He was not quickened and glorified as Christ was, but He was exalted and glorified with the

Son, at the resurrection and ascension of the latter. Both are now "most high in the glory of God the Father."

Tertullian (*adv. Prax.*) has a remarkable passage, in which, arguing against the doctrine that the Father suffered, he sets forth the suffering of the Spirit in connection with that of the Son: "Etsi Spiritus Domini quid pati possit in Filio, quia tamen non in Patre pateretur, sed in Filio, Pater passus non videretur. Sed sufficit nihil Spiritus Dei passus suo nomine; quia, si quod passus est, in Filio quidem passus est, in quo erat Pater."

In like manner the Holy Spirit is not now the Mediator, or a second Mediator, between God and man; the Man Christ Jesus alone is Mediator between *God* and *man*. But in consequence of, and in connection with, that mediatorial office which the Son received at His ascension, the Holy Spirit has received a peculiar office in the body of Christ, and for its members, of whom the Son is the glorified Head. That office is exercised in the consecration of the persons and offerings of the saints, and in the adaptation of them to be presented by Christ to His Father. In the Mediation of Christ we see that none but He who is God can present our offerings to God; in the office of the Holy Spirit we see that none but God can perfect our offerings, and so make them fit to be presented. Wherein there is no infringement on the righteousness of Christ, as the sole ground of our acceptance, and the sole righteousness that can be in us. For the Holy Spirit neither speaketh, acteth, nor showeth of Himself. The perfection with which He crowns our offerings is, though wrought by Him, still the perfection of Christ. His office bears the same relation to that of Christ, that His presence with us does to Christ's presence with us.

Let us apply these remarks to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Office of Prayer.

The bread and wine at the Holy Eucharist are brought up and offered by us in order that they may, through our instrumentality, yet by God's act, become the body and blood of Christ, which, thus constituted, we have the privilege of offering to God, in memorial of Christ's sacrifice. We believe, with the Roman Catholic Church, not, indeed, that the mere words of institution recited by the priest effect the consecration, but that it is effected by the act of the priest, in obedience to the command, and in the faith of the presence, of Christ. But though the consecration is thus effected, the act is that of a man. God has indeed acted,

but He has acted only in that form and measure in which He acts through a creature. The consecration is divine in no higher, as in no lower, sense than that in which the Sacrifice of the Eucharist is divine. And as that sacrifice is not the *very* death of Christ, or the *very* entrance of Christ personal into the Holiest, but only the memorial thereof, so is the consecration, although divine in its nature and effects, such only as a creature can perform.

The sin of the human instruments employed by God, or sin actually committed by them when so employed, can only be purged by the blood of Christ. But, altogether independent of such sin, and on the assumption that none such is committed, the act of consecration, like every act performed by a creature, carries with it the stamp of that infirmity which essentially belongs to every act of the creature—simply because it is a creature, and not God Himself, that does the act. Thus is the offering necessarily imperfect; and it cannot be made perfect otherwise than by the addition of a divine element, which shall cause it to be no longer a mere creature offering. This element is obtained by the invocation, and found in the operation, of the Holy Spirit, not merely to provide the Eucharist, for that is the work of faithful man, but to sanctify and perfect it—which God alone can do—and, out of two elements testifying of death, to make, by reconstitution into one, a sacrifice testifying of life, and meet to be offered to Him.

The Invocation of the Holy Ghost, omitted in the Roman but retained in the Greek Liturgy, is not a mere prayer that the Holy Spirit would do something in or for us, by assisting us to consecrate aright; nor is it a mere prayer that He would put forth His power in making bread and wine to be Christ's body and blood; nor is it a mere prayer that Christ would, by the Holy Ghost, perform the consecration, for He does all His works in the Church by the Holy Ghost: but, in addition to all this, it is a prayer that, after the priest, abiding in Christ (and in so far as He does so, sinless), has done his part, his very best—he in Christ, and Christ in him—the Holy Ghost Himself would, as a Divine person (although the Spirit of, and subordinate to, the Incarnate Word), descend and impart to the offering the virtue of His Divinity, that what the work of faith has produced may be perfected, and made meet for presentation through Christ, as the offering of man indeed, yet not as that alone, but as an offering crowned with the element of Divine presence—a sacrifice at once acceptable and accepted by the

fire of God—an earthly offering converted by one Divine Person into a heavenly one, to be presented by another Divine Person, not upon the altar on earth, but upon the altar in Heaven.

Moreover, as with the Eucharist, so with those who partake of it. Not only are we holpen by the Holy Spirit to partake in faith, but, having partaken, we expect to be sanctified by Him, crowned by His presence, and so made meet to be seated in heavenly places, now in faith, and afterwards in fact.

In like manner with the Office of Prayer. The Christian Church has rightly retained the practice, observed by the very heathen and enjoined by God on the Jews, of burning incense at the offering of prayer. As symbolic acts relate not to things absent, but to things present in the Church, this use of incense must express something done in the Church during prayer; and that is especially the intercession of the Holy Ghost.

In the Epistle to the Romans (ch. viii.) we are told that they fulfil the law who walk in the Spirit; that they are in the Spirit in whom the Spirit of God dwells; that they who are led by the Spirit of God are the sons of God; and that, in the spirit of adoption (υιοθεσίας)—that is, in that Spirit who is the earnest of our future sonship—we cry, “Abba, Father.” *But we are told more.* We are told not only of a work of God’s Spirit *in us*, but also of His work *for us*; namely, that He, as a separate Person, witnesses with our spirits that we are the sons and heirs of God. We are further told wherein this His concurrent testimony consists—viz., in doing that for us which He does for God’s children alone. We are still further informed what it is which He thus does for us—viz., that, while we who have the first-fruits of the Spirit do groan in ourselves, reaching out for our future sonship (which shall be declared at our entrance into glory, as that of Christ was at His), the Holy Spirit also Himself, or personally, as distinct from us, συναντιλαμβάνεται ταις ασθενειαις ἡμων, co-undertakes for, or comes to the succour of, our infirmities. And, in the last place, we learn how He does this—viz., that, while we do not know τι προσευξώμεθα καθως δεi, what we should pray as is fitting, i.e., what is prayer fitting to be presented to God by Christ as Mediator, αυτο το Πνευμα, the Holy Spirit Himself, υπερεντυγχανει ὑπερ ἡμων, prays or supplicates in addition, or over and above, for us, not merely *in us*, στεναγμοις αλαλητοις, with groanings unuttered—i.e., not as we do, with groanings uttered in the

liturgical forms of prayer, or in occasional ejaculations, but with groanings of a higher character than any human prayer, and heard by no ear but that of God—groanings which form a transaction among the Persons of the adorable Trinity, which proceed from that Spirit of God who alone knoweth the mind of God, and yet which, ascending from the Church wherein the Spirit dwells, constitute in truth the *προσευχη καθως δει*, the prayer which crowns all ours, and makes them to be prayer as it should be—prayer fit for Christ to present to the Father. Thus are our infirmities holpen, in approaching to God, by the addition of a divine intercession to ours, in such a way that the intercession is still regarded and accepted as ours. He who operates all grace in the Church is the same who intercedes for us in the Church; and, having once descended from Heaven into His temple on earth, He not only abides therein until it is taken up into glory, but intercedes without intermission till the mystery of God is finished. Identified with us, yet superior to us, and next to our glorified Head, He occupies a place of which that assigned to the Virgin Mary, as the “neck of the Church,” is the perverted indication; and when we pray in the Holy Ghost, not in mere spiritual power, but with the help of the Spirit’s intercession, the Lord has respect not only to the voice of the lowly, but also to the Spirit, whose mind He knows. (Rom. viii. 27.) Herein lies the emphasis of those words in our Liturgy by which are set forth the fourfold ground of our acceptance in prayer. 1st. That we pray according to God’s will; 2nd. That we who pray are the Body of Christ; 3rd. *That the intercessions of the Holy Ghost are known to God*; 4th. That the mediation of Christ (covering both our prayers, crowned by the intercessions of the Spirit, and those intercessions themselves) prevails with God. And as the Holy Sacrament is the proper symbol of Christ’s mediation, so is the incense that of the Spirit’s intercession.

Let us now apply this doctrinal truth to the visions of the Apocalypse.

We read in Rev. v. 8, that when the Lamb takes the book, the four living creatures and the twenty-four elders, who express the ministry and rule of the Church, fall down before Him, *εχοντες ἑκαστος κιθαρας, και φιαλας χρυσας γεμουσας θυμιαματων, αι εισιν αι προσευχαι των ἁγιων*, having each harps and vials brimful of odoriferous things, which (odoriferous things) are the prayers of the saints. This points out praise and prayer as the two chief components of worship; and,

concerning prayer, it indicates the difference between the vials and their contents. The vials are not the prayers—their contents are the prayers. Of these contents the vials are full to the brim ; and these golden vials, thus filled, and held in the hand of each living creature and elder, are not the saints or their prayers, but the various forms of truth which those prayers should fill with life in holy worship.

What, then, are these odours or odoriferous things, these *θυμιαματα* ? This we learn from Rev. viii. 3, where the sounding of the seven trumpets is introduced by the twofold use of an incense store-vessel, first for the offering of incense on the altar, and then for the casting of the fire of the altar into the earth. We there see an angel standing *ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, at or on the altar, having *λίβανωτον χρυσοῦν*, a golden incense-vessel, and to whom are given *θυμιαματα πολλὰ*, many odoriferous things, *ἵνα δώσῃ ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων*, that he may give or add them to the prayers of all the saints, *ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, at or on the golden altar, before the throne. Whereupon the smoke *τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων*, of the odoriferous things, (added to) the prayers of the saints, ascends up before God. The odoriferous things which, in the former vision, are seen as being already in the vials, are here seen as before they are put into them, and as they are contained in a *λίβανωτος*, or vessel for holding a supply of incense. These odoriferous things are not, as some would read it, given or presented by or through means of, but are added to, the prayers, as one part of a compound is added to another. The vials are not the prayers, but they are the forms which should contain the prayers ; therefore they hold a compound composed of the odoriferous things and the prayers to which these odoriferous things are added. And as, in the former vision, the odoriferous things are identified with the prayers, it is plain that the addition of these odoriferous things is that which makes the prayers worthy of the name, and which fits them for ascending up before God. The prayers of the saints are accepted by reason of something which is added to them, which embraces, covers, and perfects them, as a thing distinct from, yet mingled with, themselves. In other words, the Holy Spirit residing in the Church as the Spirit of Truth, instead of offering incense received from man, gives forth incense, to be added to man's prayers, out of His storehouse, as the Filler of all things. And the intercession of the Spirit is ever added to our prayers when we pray in the Holy Ghost. We lay them on the earthly altar ;

the Holy Spirit takes them up to the heavenly. The place also where this addition is made, at or on the altar, informs us that the intercession of the Spirit does not, like His ordinary guidance or promptings, enter into the formation of our prayers, but is a grace added to and bestowed upon them after they are formed and ready to be offered, in order thus to fit them for acceptance by the fire of God. Finally, the plural number of the odoriferous things, coupled with that of the prayers, shows us that, as often as faithful prayer is made, the intercession of the Spirit is so also, and that the Holy Spirit, distributed throughout the body of Christ, not only supplies His intercession to prayer as a whole, but applies it to all the individuals and acts which compose the whole; in other words, that His agency as Paraclete corresponds to the number of persons and variety of prayers in the Church. It is not undeserving of inquiry, how far the composition of the incense under the law may afford instruction not only as to the ingredients of our prayer, but as to the offices of the Paraclete in connection with it.

Not till the supply of incense is all applied and exhausted is the incense store-vessel empty and ready to be filled with fire from the altar. In other words, judgment does not go forth till the prayers of the saints and the intercession of the Spirit are finished: when He shall return to His glory, taking up with Him those whose prayers He has in Christ's stead continually made valid and perfect.

The above remarks as to the Ministry of the Paraclete in prayer are not to be understood as implying that the use of incense is in no sense to be regarded as a symbol, both of Christ's intercession in Heaven and of faithful prayer arising from the hearts and lips of men; on the contrary, it is the counterpart of one and the associate of the other. But whatever the mediation of Christ may be for the world, in the Church His mediation is not intended for any prayers but those to which the intercession of the Spirit can be added. There should be no others in the Church. The two things should never be divorced. Therefore, while the incense symbolizes that intercession of the Holy Ghost which sanctifies, it has certainly, also, a legitimate application to the prayers which are sanctified thereby, and to the mediation through which they ascend. Our prayers are not, strictly speaking, to use the Psalmist's words (Ps. cxli. 2), "set forth before God as incense" until the intercession of the Holy Ghost is added to them. With this addition, we are indeed for a sweet-smelling savour unto God; and, having boldness of

access into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus, as our Paraclete in Heaven, we derive from the mighty succour and incessant pleadings of the Holy Spirit, as the Paraclete who is beside us on earth, a peace and security, a power and largeness of prayer, an assurance of being heard on high, and a triumphant foretaste of things hoped for, to which we should else be strangers.

ON SYMBOLS IN WORSHIP.

1853.

ON SYMBOLS IN WORSHIP.

*“Τὰ μὲν αἰσθητοὺς ἱερά των νοητῶν ἀπεικονίσματα, καὶ ἐπ’ αὐτὰ
χειραγωγία καὶ ὁδός.”*

THE whole visible creation is a symbol. Man's body is a symbol of his being. His acts, his postures, his words, in all his social intercourse, are symbols of his thoughts. The institutions of this world teem with the symbolic use of the creatures. To require the exclusion of symbols from all religious exercises, is to require that man shall become not merely a new but a different creature, and live in a different world, before he can worship God. Forasmuch as man is body, soul, and spirit, redeemed to God in all the three parts of his being, and is not only placed in, but set as lord over, and commissioned to use, the visible world, his worship must be offered in each part of his being, and must include his use of the creatures.

None but silent worship and unwritten word are strictly unsymbolical ; for word is the symbol of thought. Even if worship is regarded as an attitude of soul known to God without word, we symbolize that attitude by the words which we use. But the present questions are—first, Whether we may address God or man by other means additional to word ? and, second, Whether we may express one transaction by another accompanying it, or one truth by two or more transactions at once ?

These questions are already practically answered in the affirmative. Every worshipper or minister, whether appropriately or not, suits his looks, posture, and gestures to his words and acts. Every place of worship is filled with symbols, good or bad. The sacraments and ordinances of the Church all imply the symbolic use of man's body and of the creatures. The primitive Christians introduced symbolic rites as soon as they could, and in the order in which it was practicable, beginning, perhaps, with the sign of the cross—just as many good things were introduced

subsequent to Moses. Three-fourths of Christendom not only sanction symbols, but find the greatest aid to faith in their use. The present Apostolic Churches have, in the light of prophecy, already employed not only symbols elsewhere recognized—*e.g.*, unleavened bread and reservation of the Eucharist—but others also (such as the four patens and the seven cups used in the seven churches, and the seating of ministers in council and worship) more especially connected with their peculiar place and calling. Yet we are not bound or even entitled to wait for light of prophecy on matters regarding which the light of nature, the dictates of propriety, and the practice of the Church are so clear.

It is, therefore, too late in the history of the world, of man, and of the Church, to exclude symbolism altogether from religious services. Indeed, no one would seriously assume such an untenable position. The real objections against symbolism, whether as the results of argument or as the dictates of prejudice, rest on one or other of the four following grounds: *viz.*, the danger of Judaizing; the danger of formality, superstition, idolatry, and ostentation; the danger of anticipating the kingdom to come; and the absence of express authority.

As to the first, we must distinguish between a type and a symbol. A type points to a thing absent and future, a symbol to a thing present. When the antitype appears, the type is abolished. The shadow is banished by the substance. But the symbol cannot appear till the substance is there; and its continuance depends on that of the substance. Where the type ends the symbol begins; and, therefore, symbolism can never be a return to types and shadows; nor does the previous use of a creature as a type exclude its present use as a symbol. God has made every creature with its own properties. His typical use of it accords with these. When the substance comes, the *typical use*, indeed, ceases for ever; but the *use* does not. The creature retains its qualities; it demands a use consistent with them, and therefore more or less analogous to its former typical employment. That former employment does not debar it from being afterwards employed by God. Were we to strike out from use in Christian worship every creature once used under the shadows of the law, we should mutilate the very sacraments. We may not repeat the laver and the candlestick, the breastplate or the vail; but we may use as symbols water, gold, oil, fire, jewels, incense,

colours, and vestments, according to the standing properties of each.

As to the second, the fear is not ungrounded; for it is justified by too sad experience. But would not the same argument lead to the abolition of the sacraments, of attendance at church, of reading the Word, of preaching, of prayer? They have all been abused much more than any symbols. And although the relinquishment of many symbolic rites may have been a most fit act of discipline at the time, it can form no argument for their permanent exclusion in altered circumstances. The right way to avoid formality is not to avoid the form, but to express and nourish life by it. The way to avoid superstition is not to abolish the means, but to use them in faith. The way to avoid idolatry is not to destroy the picture, but to perceive only that which is represented. The safeguard against ostentation is not to close the exhibition, but to exhibit before God. Christendom has become a vast heap of rubbish; and if we will not pick the jewels from the heap, we must do without them. If the jewels were already in their right place, Apostles were not needed. The real objection felt is not to symbols as a whole, but to a certain class of symbols, which are, or seem to be, false in principle, or which, from congenital prejudices or better causes, we think irrevocably defiled.

As to the third, it is evidently wrong to use the creatures, in their and our present fallen condition, as if they were already delivered from the curse. But the present subjection of all things to the curse does not abolish their properties and adaptations. The atonement of Christ has redeemed every creature to His use, and therefore to ours. We dare not use what is not redeemed. The word to Peter, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common," is of universal application. The redemption of the creatures is yet to be *manifested*, but it is already *effected*, and warrants their use in the worship of faith. Were the soul of man alone now redeemed, and did his body wait for a future redemption, and not merely for the manifestation of its present redemption, our souls would not only have no right, but no power, to use any one creature as a symbol, even in the sacraments. But if Christ has redeemed the whole of man's being, the right and duty of man to use his body—nay, his tongue—as a thing redeemed, in the worship of God, imply his right and duty to use, in the same way, the rest of creation. The limit lies not in the want of

warrant, but in the incapacity of that which is yet subject to vanity to serve God. Its use is lawful, as far as possible. As we do not refuse any earnest of the future glory which God may give us by any act of power and mercy in the Church, so it cannot be wrong to use the glory and beauty of creatures as symbols of that glory and beauty which lie hidden in the Church, and as earnest of their own future glory. Provided we remember that they and we are yet subject to vanity, any such use of them according to their natural properties, instead of satisfying us with our present position as a substitute for the future, will serve to kindle our desires for the future. Indeed, the use of symbols not only exhibits the perfect thing better than words, but is our great preservative against regarding that which we now have as the perfect thing. Moreover, it is in the highest degree inconsistent to refuse the use of things glorious and beautiful in God's house, and sanction it in the State, in the family, and in our own persons. For if our and their subjection to the curse is an argument against their use even there where we have to do with the glorious promises and presence of God, how much stronger is it against that use in every other sphere of man's being! If we may lawfully use things glorious, according to our place and ability, at all, we may do it with least danger in God's house; and the danger is to be avoided, not by expressing nothing of the glory, but by being thereby led to press more on towards it as future; not by exhibiting nothing, but by exhibiting all before God.

As to the fourth, the express authority for some symbols is an encouragement and a guide in using others, not a prohibition. Where symbolic action is natural to man, and creatures have certain properties which he is at liberty to use for all other purposes, the burden of proof that they may not be used symbolically in worship lies on him who would prevent the use; and if we have added *words* to those of Christ in worship, we may equally add symbols to His, if true ones. But, in truth, although we rightly require express authority for a sacramental use of the creatures by which they are made efficacious, the demand for it as to uses merely symbolic is as irrational as the demand for express authority to laugh in joy or to weep in sorrow. The literal imposition of a perfect symbolism at the first would have both given it an almost sacramental place, and done violence to its true origin and use as an expression of devotion. Its gradual development is the natural result

of circumstances, but, in its main features, not the less divine.

The use of symbols, then, is only the employment of means which our possession of the creatures and our knowledge of their properties afford us, to do the same thing in more ways than one, and thus obtain every collateral aid to our faith, and utterance to our feelings, in acts of worship. As no man should boast of being able to stand on one leg, but thankfully use both, so should we not pride ourselves on being edified in one way, but thankfully use all. Yet such things are helps only to the spiritual and well-instructed. They may hinder others; but the fault lies in the condition of mind which makes this hindrance possible. Everything that in any language or by any act tells out our faith and hope, must rejoice the spiritual. The more various the forms, the greater their joy.

The conditions of true symbolism are—

1. That symbols be used, as before God, to represent things presently existing or transacted in the Church.

2. That they be used consistently with the qualities of the creature and the dictates of nature.

3. That they be used according to the express directions or plain analogy of Scripture.

4. That they be used in conformity to the best and widest practice of the Church, controlled by the natural properties and the scriptural use of the creatures.

5. That they be used intelligently, as part of a reasonable service, in which we know what we do, what we express, and why we so express it, and believe in the thing expressed.

6. That they be used as accessories, and not as essentials—as aids to devotion, not as its objects; and although on fixed principles, yet only in that degree and manner which wisdom and charity dictate at the time.

7. That they be used in accordance with the present light of prophecy, by which the forgotten meaning of ancient rites is revived, and their distorted or imperfect form restored.

A due attention to these conditions will serve to deliver us from various errors—from the barrenness of Protestant, and the cumbrous superfluity of Greek and Roman rites; from the blind adoption of existing forms, and the invention of novelties; from the rejection of former light, and the exclusion of present; from that un-genuine humility, that morbid simplicity, and that pious slovenliness by which God is robbed of His honour; and from that parade and

ostentation by which the spiritual are grieved and the fleshly attracted. It is a great mistake to think that symbolism must necessarily be found best where it is most largely employed. There traces of its great principles are still to be found, which the truly spiritual can detect and apply; but the great mass of priests and people no longer know the true import of the rites they use, and have no longer the faith or feelings which those rites should express. Their service is the very reverse of reasonable. It must be fraught with formality, superstition, idolatry, and ostentation; and the same practices which should edify the spiritual, defile and harden such worshippers; for they use the creatures not only without intelligence, but often in ways at variance with the true properties of the same, and with the place and use assigned to them in Scripture. They have thus justly offended many of the faithful, and prevented others from seeing the true excellence of such rites. And they are thus unprepared to receive that further light on the subject which accords with altered circumstances, and which the approaching perfection of the Church demands. Of this perfection, symbolism frequently affords a purer expression and fuller anticipation than words can do.

The provinces of symbolism are chiefly four: first, the arrangement of the place of worship; second, the vestments of the ministers; third, the postures or actions of the worshippers; fourth, the substances employed in the service of God's house.

1. The Building.

No one will deny that the place where God is worshipped, not by individuals or families, but by the Church, should be exclusively devoted to that end. And if so, then its form should indicate its use, so that no man can mistake it either for a private dwelling, a barn or a ball-room, a court of justice or a theatre, an exchange or a palace. Without excluding other forms, we can say that if the form is to be significant at all, one of the most appropriate forms (due regard being had to practical convenience) is that of the cross, in which we are to glory and through which we rise into life; so that we may bear about the dying of the Lord Jesus even in our outward things. It should be lofty, or at least should, in all its forms, point upwards, to indicate aspirations of soul, and not transactions among men; and it should lie from west to east, to indicate our spiritual progress from darkness to light, and our hope of seeing the Sun of Righteousness at His return.

As all persons are not in the same ecclesiastical position, the building should be divided accordingly. For this practice, we have the example of Heathens, Jews, and the primitive Church—nay, an analogy from the very teaching of nature in worldly things. The heathen should be separate from the baptized, the excommunicate and penitents from the holy, and the catechumens from the perfect. No less should the priests, by virtue of their office, be separate from the laity—not because they are holier, not for the preference of men, not because their worship is distinct from that of the laity, but because their duty is different, and those who perform it should be distinguished from others. Those who contend against a separate priesthood, on the ground that all Christians are priests, and therefore worshippers, are, remarkably enough, those who take least part in worship, and understand it least. Of the priests, the ministers in the universal Church should be distinguished from those in the particular. And, lastly, the deacons should be in front of the flock, as their representatives towards God, and as their ears to hear what God shall speak.

The various acts done in the church should be done in different places, for they are different exercises of the grace of Christ—who is now seen as the giver of life, now as the sustainer of it, now as our purifier, now as our anointer, now as our mediator, now as our enlightener, now as our hope. The font should be at the entrance, because by baptism we are brought into the communion of the Church. It should be well seen, that the sacrament may be honoured and remembered. Where holy water is used, it should also be at the entrance, that they which enter to worship or to hear may remember that they are washed through baptism, and are to be washed with the water of the Word, and may come, with sprinkled conscience, into contact with God's ordinances. The place for the relief of spiritual burdens by counsel and absolution should also be near the entrance, to indicate the ministry of help, and the removal of hindrance in approaching to God; and although it should not be prominent, it should not be hidden away, so as to minister any occasion to the tempter or the slanderer. The organ, or other aid to singing, should be on high, not only on acoustic grounds, but because our songs are, in spirit, not sung on earth, where we are in a strange land, but in Heaven, where Christ raised His new song and the angels echoed the strain. The chancel or choir, where worship is conducted, should be separate from the nave; for the Lord, who offers our

worship, is separated from us. Yet it should not be hid, for the way into the Holiest is patent; and it should be elevated, not merely for the sake of seeing and hearing, but because our worship, although composed on earth, is presented in Heaven. There are three grades of worship—ordinary prayer, intercession, and the eucharistic sacrifice, which is not only the highest act of worship, but the memorial of that on which all intercession—nay, all worship—is based. Therefore, although the choir in itself is a unity, forming one of three divisions in the church, with the nave and the porch, yet there should be stages in the choir corresponding to the stages of worship. And as the service of the particular church is distinct from that of the universal, so should, in the choir, the sanctuary, wherein the latter (embracing the Eucharist) is performed, be distinguished from the two other and inferior stages of the choir, where the higher and lower forms of service are conducted in the particular church. But it should not be hid, as in the Greek Church, nor should it be separated off, as the chancel is from the nave, because the worship of the particular church is as heavenly as that in the universal, and forms part of a unity with it.

In this matter we perceive that error in the symbolism, not of the Scriptures, but of the practice in the early Church, which resulted from the loss of Apostles and their companions in the universal ministry. In the primitive Church, the bishop's throne stood behind at the east of the altar, with those of his elders on each side. And were there no larger thing than the particular church—were each church independent, much could not be said against the symbol. But it is plain that, in thus representing the headship of the Lord by the bishop of each church, the ancients excluded the possibility of testifying for His office as the universal bishop by any symbolism in the particular church, and exhibited no symbol of the union of all individual churches by the bond of Christ's universal episcopate, exercised and seen in the Apostles and other ministers of the universal Church. The arrangement of the particular church, instead of confessing, thus denied that all angels are, as stars, held through Apostles in the one hand of the Lord. And the vision in the Apocalypse, by which this has been attempted to be justified, is the very antidote to the error, inasmuch as the throne there seen is not that of the bishop in a particular church, but that of the Lord Himself, Bishop over the universal as a unity from Pentecost to the end, with His twenty-four Apostles, as His elders, around Him.

Therefore, in the particular church, no one should sit behind the altar at all ; and none should be on its platform save the celebrant at the Eucharist, or perhaps the Apostles (accompanied by their fellow-labourers) as elders of the absent Angel of the Covenant.

As the elder is distinguished from the other three ministers, by sharing in the rule of the angel, so the bishop and his elders, although each has his separate seat, occupy, properly speaking, but one throne, within the embrace of which the fourfold ministry acts. True symbolism leaves place for the universal ministry, and the universal ministry admits Christ Himself.

Further : As the Eucharist is the highest act of devotion and communion, and forms the centre of worship, the altar must be the most sacred part and the centre of the church, if there is to be any outward expression at all which shall answer to the things transacted. We should, therefore, look to it ; and, as we should also look to the east, it should be at the east end of the choir, that we may worship towards the east. The very sin of worshipping the rising sun, alluded to by Ezekiel, is an argument not against, but for this practice. Antichrist, as the Son of the Morning, the hope of his expectants, is the very mockery of Christ, and we are to contradict his false worship, not by turning from the east, but by worshipping the true Sun of Righteousness. And we may as well talk of worshipping together without worshipping one God, as of worshipping one God in the faith of one altar without reference to that altar. The shape of the altar may vary, according to the predominance given to one or other of the various things transacted there. If it is like a tomb, it indicates the resurrection of the Lord, and the safe keeping of the departed. It may also testify for the presence of Christ in the tabernacle above it, as in the ark of old. Regarded strictly as an altar, it indicates that God, who elsewhere accepts our inferior offerings, there accepts and enjoys our sacrifice of Christ's body and blood. Regarded as a table, it indicates our heavenly nourishment. The chief thing is to hold fast and express the two great transactions of worship and feeding. And in reference to them we can say, that while every altar is also a table, every table is not an altar. As to the reverence fit to be made towards the altar, the Church of England, although she does not acknowledge any eucharistic offering of the body and blood of Christ, or allow that the altar is more than a table, does still require that all who enter the

church shall reverently bow towards the altar, on the ground of its being the place where the highest mysteries of the faith are celebrated. The Romish and Greek Churches (although the former has so grievously erred through carnal attempts to make the real presence intelligible) have retained the additional and higher consideration, that the body and blood of Christ are offered there. And we know that the Romanists devote their monstrance solely to the exhibition of Christ's presence in the Sacrament. Therefore, having taken one of the greatest of all the steps by which God has led us, in reserving the Holy Eucharist on the altar, for proposition in worship, and in asserting the real presence without transubstantiation, we have a double reason, both the Romish and the Anglican, for reverently bowing to the altar, as to the place where the tabernacle testifies to Christ's presence with the Father in the Holiest of all, where the memorial of His priestly sacrifice is laid up and proposed, and whence we are fed with the bread of God and strengthened with the wine of the kingdom. For this cause, it is better that the Sacrament should be reserved on the altar, and not elsewhere, that there may not be two centres of honour in the church, but both combined in one. If, then, we believe that the altar is especially the place of God's presence, to which we flee for shelter and cleave for safety, we see why it should be adorned with every symbol of dignity, covered over as His pavilion under which we are protected, and furnished out with every expression of hope and glory and joy. Finally, the ornaments of the church should not be such as gratify mere classical taste, and exhibit artistic display and worldly gorgeousness, but such as minister to faith, and therefore should be so framed and disposed as to be in keeping with the parts of the church where they appear, the services which they adorn, and the feelings which should be experienced. There is nothing in which all Churches, especially the Roman, have more erred than in this. If the direction of the church from west and east indicates our progress to the end of our calling, and if the altar is the utmost limit of our attainment in this world, then the ornament of the building should increase as we go eastward. The paintings, sculptures, or other decorations at the west end should exhibit the things that we have passed—the fall and its consequences, the flood, the old covenant, the beginnings of the Christian life, or the past history of the Church. The nave should exhibit present grace, in its simpler forms; the choir, the same, in its

highest mysteries; and the space beyond the altar, the heavenly or future things in which we believe, or which we expect. What can be a greater violation of such a principle than altar-pieces exhibiting the Nativity, the Crucifixion, the Baptist, the Virgin and Child, the Law, or the Old Testament Prophets—nay, the Ten Tables, the arms of kings and patrons, or tablets in memory of the dead? The very crosses seen at the altar should be such as indicate victory; and a crucifix on or near the altar, or beyond it, is an anachronism which can only confuse, depress, or render morbid the worshippers.

2. The Vestments are the garments in which the ministers are to appear, not before man, but before God. Here nature and usage, which dictate the clothing of the naked body, and a variety of dress for various occupations and places—for the workshop, the chase, the saloon, the court—are our first guides. Without ecclesiastical dresses, the ministers are as it were naked, and, without suitable dresses, uncivilized.

The vestments should not be our usual garments in the world, but set apart to the house of God, confined to it, and distinguished by their form from those used elsewhere. They should, by their texture, their colour, their form, and their number, express the peculiar service in which they are worn, and the position of the wearer. They should be catholic, and not borrowed from any one party or place, or expressive of any mere fancy in religion. On this head, we must be greatly on our guard against substituting taste for principle, or authority for truth, against being led by habit, or deterred by prejudice. The simple surplice or rochette for the lower, and the ornamented rochette for the higher orders, indicate ministry in general, and, by their white colour, the purity of the same. The white alb betokens the holy priesthood; the girdle, the strength required for its exercise; the stole, obedience in bearing the burden of ministry; the cope, dignity, presidency, rule, headship, or mediation; the chasuble, the unity of the body covered by the sacrifice and glory of Christ; the gold, the truth; the silver, the love; the jewels, the glory and beauty of ministry; the colours of cloth or jewels, the species of the ministry; their changes, the diversities of days and seasons, and services, and the expression of mourning, hope, or joy; the cross, the pre-eminence in following the Lamb; the ring, the marriage with the Church; the mitre, if worn, the truth and dignity of spiritual headship and representation.

3. The Posture. The stretching out of the hand is an act of power or indication; to sit, is the act of a lord and ruler; to stand, that of ministry, attendance, or triumph and praise; to kneel, that of a suppliant or servant; to bow, that of homage, fealty, reverence, and worship; to lie prostrate, that of penitence, humiliation, entreaty, or agony. Our posture, therefore, should be regulated by our occupation. Our Lord's own example is our warrant for stretching out the hand to bless. The indication, nay, the contact of the hand should be used in consecration; the lifting up of the hand in attestation and appeal. We should not sit when ministering, save from the place of rule; we should stand when hearkening to the Word, at least to the Holy Gospel, which relates Christ's words and acts; we should not sit or kneel in thanksgiving, praise, and triumph; we should not stand either in presidency and judgment, or in confession and supplication; it is comely to bow the head as an expression of reverence for the names of the adorable Trinity, or before the symbols of Christ's presence; we should bow the knee—nay, it may be, on certain occasions, prostrate ourselves—in acts of adoration; we should especially bow the knee (as the Scripture saith) at the name of Jesus, whenever it is introduced in solemn confession of His name and honour, or in solemnly relating His words and acts; for He is not only our God, as the Father and Holy Spirit are, but the revealer of the Godhead, and, as Son of Man, our Lord. And we may learn from the Greek Church how suitable prostration is to many passages in the Church's experience, and to many parts of her holy rites. We have not yet learned to cast ourselves down in good earnest before the offended presence, or under the mighty hand of God.

The sign of the cross is partly a private, partly a public rite. In the one case, it is entirely voluntary and optional, dictated by personal feeling; in the other, it may be enjoined. But in both cases, it has the same import—dedication, pardon, preservation, confirmation of good, banishment of evil, through appeal to the power of Christ's cross. Tertullian and the other earliest Fathers show us how universal was the use of this sacred sign, both in the domestic affairs of the saints, and in the defence against, and deliverance from, calamity and evil spirits; and, as in baptism, so in receiving the communion, and in acts of consecration and blessing, the sign of the cross is most appropriate, claiming all things for Christ, and His protection for us.

4. The use of other creatures.

Seven creatures used in the tabernacle service have an abiding application to seven offices of Christ—bread to the life, wine to the joy and hope, oil to the unction, water to the cleansing, incense to the intercession, light to the guidance, salt to the covenant standing, of the Church in Him.

The first is Light. We here speak not of light by which to read or move about, as a mere substitute for the absent light of day, nor of light with which to create a mere glare or to form beautiful objects in the eyes of men, but of light to be used in the daytime, a symbol of our walking in a different light from that of nature; as the poet saith, “Nocte dieque micant.” This even the Heathen sought to set forth. The Jews did so in their divinely-appointed rites; and the earliest hymns of the Christian Church, the decisions of Councils, and the records of spoliation in churches by the wicked, all take the use of lights in the worship of the early Church for granted. God, who dwelleth in the thick darkness, is light. Christ, the Incarnate Word, is the Light of the world, and much more of His Church. We, through baptism into Him, are illuminated or made light in the Lord; so that, as we confess that there is one Holy, and we in Him, so there is one Light, and we in Him. The kindling of light, therefore, in the Church is to symbolize the presence of Christ, not as He is in Heaven, but as He is on earth—not as He is in the world, but as He is in the Church. How is He, then, present in the Church? In four forms:

1st. By the Sacrament of His body and blood. This is one sacrament, though in two species. His presence here is indicated by one lamp burning before the Holy Sacrament when kept in the tabernacle on the altar, or in the sacristy.

2nd. By His Word, and especially by the word of the Gospels, which testify directly of Him, and record His words and deeds, and are therefore called, in distinction from other inspired Scriptures, the *Holy* Gospels. His presence in this form is indicated by one light burned at the reading of the Gospel, reminding us not only of the Divine illumination which we require to understand it, but also of Him to whom the Gospel testifies.

3rd. By His ministers in the universal Church. Of these, the two chief are apostles and prophets, symbolized in the Old Testament by two pipes, two staves, two cherubim. The lighting of two lights, one at each side of the altar, is our acknowledgment that Christ, the one light

of the body, is present in His catholic ministries. The Church of England, in her better days, allowed these lights, although her reason for doing so was very inadequate. She proposed to symbolize by them merely that Christ was the true Light of the world. But she did not confess Him as the Light of His Church. She did not confess that He was so through His ministries. And she attempted no explanation of the number 2. The Lutheran Church has retained the lights, without a vestige of understanding as to their meaning; and she has set them on the altar, where no minister ever is, save the Pope. And the Roman Catholic Church, even where she has two lights, is perfectly ready to have as many more as the purse of the flock may supply, or ostentation may demand; and thus shows, by the very multitude of her lights, her ignorance of their symbolical meaning and her harlot love of show.

4th. By His people, and the ministers of the particular Church. We who are baptized, and abide in Christ, are the φωτισμενοι, or enlightened. This truth is shown forth, although unconsciously, when, on certain occasions, every person who comes to church carries a small taper in his hand, confessing thus to his standing as an individual in Christ. But in the worship of the Church, the standing of the faithful as an aggregate must be shown forth; and this is done by the kindling of that number of lights which expresses ecclesiastical unity and completeness—namely, the number 7. The unity of the flock, both in its members and in its ministries (seen especially in the angel and six elders), is thus shown forth, either by seven lights for both, or by seven in the choir and seven in the nave; and is, in either case, contrasted with the two which testify of Christ's light for the universal Church; and the constant testimony is given that our worship proceeds not only from the new creature, but also from one body. The number 8, the symbol of that new dispensation into which we are brought by baptism, as by circumcision on the eighth day, has also its application. Although the newness of life which it does express is already expressed by light itself, yet it may find a fit place in the nave, when seven lights are in the chancel. Lastly, all these lights are to be sustained by pure vegetable oil, not by turpentine, wax, animal oil, or gas; for oil is the symbol of that anointing with the Spirit of life and blessing, in the power of which all worship and ministry are performed, in which sacraments are rightly administered and enjoyed, and Holy Scripture rightly read and understood. We are, in

one sense, the oil, which, by the fire of God's presence, is converted into light, and rendered ethereal and heavenly.

Incense is used, not in a mere indefinite act of homage to God's majesty, and still less in homage paid to men or creatures, nor to produce a sweet odour in the nostrils of men, but to symbolize that which is a sweet odour unto God. And that is not the mere sweet savour of the burnt-offering, on its proper altar, the acceptable self-dedication of the faithful, but the expression of their desires, as on the altar of incense, according to the will of God, after they have already dedicated themselves. The ground on which our prayers are accepted is fourfold: 1. That they are agreeable to God's will; 2. That they are uttered by His Church; 3. That they are accompanied by the intercessions of the Holy Ghost, who prayeth in the body of Christ, and who, by His sanctification, maketh our prayers such as Christ can present; 4. That they are embraced in the intercession of Christ, who prayeth for His body, and presenteth all that cometh up from it, sanctified by the addition of the intercessions of the Spirit. As, in itself, the incense has no sweet odour till kindled on the burning censer, when its smoke ascends on high, so are the desires of the saints, burned, as it were, on the priestly fire, officially brought to the knowledge of God, by the priestly ministry of prayer, when taken up into the mouth of the priest. And the intercession of Christ in the Church, taking up into itself, in due proportion, every element of prayer, does not remain on earth waiting to be afterwards carried up into Heaven, but passes directly thither, presented in His name who mediates as one that has overcome, and who is our Advocate with the Father. Therefore is the use of incense not in place when mere supplications and prayers are made, but only when these are crowned with intercession, the symbol of Christ's voice in the Holiest, in entering which He completed all previous approach of men to God. As the ingredients in the incense of old indicated the constituent parts of intercession, there may be a similar analogy in the symbolic composition of incense now. But, at all events, the burning of incense, compounded or simple, which, as if by instinct, has been withheld from scarcely any heathen deity, and was expressly commanded in the Jewish law, cannot, on any tenable ground, be withheld in the Christian worship of the true God. Our earlier ecclesiastical records bear witness to the practice; and the vast majority of Christendom have retained it, although they have perverted it by much false symbolism

and idolatrous use. The only exceptions have been those times when it was identified with the acknowledgment of the heathen gods, during persecution, as in the days of Tertullian, and these later times in which men have thought to worship God as mere souls, without using either their bodies or the visible creation in His service, and have held material and carnal to be synonymous words.

Oil is the symbol of lustre, health, and joy. Among the Heathens and Jews it was used at the anointing of kings and priests. And if we are kings and priests unto God, we should have not only the anointing, but the symbol of it; not sacramentally, not as a channel of grace, but as a fit accessory and a confirmation of faith; the work done on the body being the correlative of the work done on the soul, as Tertullian says, "*Caro ungitur ut anima consecratur.*" If the gift of the Holy Ghost, by the laying on of Apostles' hands, is the anointing of Christ, oil should be used at the services for sealing the faithful and for ordaining the called. And we have a full sanction for the principle of its use under the Christian dispensation, in the express command of Scripture to anoint the sick. We need further light as to chrism and its constituents.

Holy water may or may not be the water previously used in baptism. Where it is, its use, although, of course, without the sacramental efficacy, stands somewhat in the same relation to the sacrament of baptism that the communion on the reserved elements stands in to the Eucharist. But, independent of the actual reservation of water used in baptism, the sprinkling with holy water is a symbolic act, whereby the remembrance of our baptism is refreshed, our continued cleansing by Christ is realized, and our hearts are prepared for faithful worship and the hearing of His Word. In addition to this, the washing of the hands of the celebrant previous to the celebration of the canon at the Eucharist, is the fit visible counterpart of the words sung while the elements are placed on the altar for consecration.

Salt, which actually keeps from corruption, was used by Moses to purify water, and directed to be offered with every offering under the law, as the sign of preservation and acceptance through the covenant of God. The command of Christ to have "salt in ourselves" plainly implies that the symbolic use of salt is still legitimate; and a large portion of the Church has employed it, both dry and dissolved in water, although sometimes in ways at variance with its proper meaning, often with much superstition, and generally with

little or no intelligence. Its appropriate place appears to be whenever special reference is made to the covenant of God. Although it is not admitted into the bread of the Eucharist, and although the Greek Church has refused to dissolve it in water for baptism, as the Romish does, there seems much propriety in its being put into the water with which we sprinkle ourselves, or are sprinkled, on entering the church ; as on that occasion we do not enter into the covenant, but appeal to it for grace and blessing. An additional, but minor, consideration is the prevention of the water from becoming foul by standing.

Lastly, Music. It is remarkable how many who are jealous of symbolism are, in this matter, the greatest of all symbolists, not only by admitting instrumental music, but by neglecting, through indolence or wandering of heart, to utter those responses of which the music is but the symbol ; thus not only admitting a symbol, but banishing the reality. Instrumental music should encourage and guide the use of man's voice, and should cease if it works otherwise. For, although those who have no voice and ear should not sing, yet, where those who have do, the harmony and melody in the hearts of all are expressed by some, as in all those other cases in which the whole body acts by certain members. And care should be taken that the character of the music be in agreement with the season at which it is used, and the meaning of that which it accompanies, and that it do not interfere with the full liberty of singing in the power of the Holy Spirit. If everything that hath breath should praise the Lord, all creatures are also summoned to do so. Man is set at the head of the inanimate creatures, that he may, by the skill which God gives to him, make them vocal towards God. And if every heathen idol and worldly conqueror is praised with instrumental music, much more the living God, in the congregations of those who make melody in their hearts unto Him.

The above remarks must not be taken as pretending to exhaust the subject of Symbolism, or as giving a full catalogue of the creatures capable of symbolical use in God's service, but merely as pointing out some of the more prominent features of the subject and the materials to be employed, and as a contribution to help further inquiry and to facilitate the use of symbols in worship ; in which use, as in all things, the Apostles should set the example to the churches.

ON THE
EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

1854.

ON THE EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

WE have many reasons for giving especial heed to the Epistles addressed by John to the Seven Churches in Asia. 1. They occur in the only book which, from beginning to end, is a "Revelation of Jesus Christ," concerning things then future, consisting of the word of God, the testimony of Jesus Christ, and the visions vouchsafed to John, clothed in language woven out of threads from every part of Old Testament Scripture, and intended to realize the blessing of hearkening to those words and keeping those writings of prophecy which should all speedily be gathered up in one fulfilment at the time of the end. 2. They were written by that Apostle whose words were the last canonical instruction to the Church, when she was launched from the haven of her origin upon the wide waters of the world, there to float till she should reach the haven of her consummation—by that Apostle, too, of whom the Lord said, "If I will that he remain until I come," and who actually did tarry till Jesus showed the type of His second coming in the destruction of Jerusalem. 3. They were written not only by express direction of Christ (Rev. i. 2—19), but in conjunction with a command to impart to the seven Churches the vision of Him from whom the epistles came, in order to assure those Churches that, although locally absent, He was, as the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek, really in the midst of them, in His wisdom, discernment, holiness, worship, testimony, discipline, glory, and redeeming power; and that the ministry among them was appointed, maintained, and exercised by Himself. 4. The Churches thus addressed, and the matter addressed to them, were invested with a catholic character, as representing the Church, and Christ's words to the Church, in all places and at all times.

While this "Apocalypse" was given by God to Jesus Christ, in order that He might show to His servants the

things which should "shortly come to pass" (Rev. i. 1), the things which John, in receiving this Apocalypse, saw, were expressly divided into two classes—viz., "the things that are" and "the things that should come to pass after them" (Rev. i. 19). The things which should "shortly come to pass" were evidently the whole antecedents and accompaniments of that future kingdom which Christ had gone to receive, in so far as God saw fit to reveal them. And these were divided chronologically into two successive parts—things present and things future. Now we know where the things future begin. At Rev. iv. 1, we read, "After these things I looked;" and again, "I will show unto thee the things which must come to pass after these things." Therefore we know that the Epistles to the Churches refer to the things present, as distinguished from the things future.

But what do "present" and "future" here mean? Where does the present end? Where does the future begin? It is plain that the end of the former must determine the beginning of the latter. Where, then, does the "present" end? This depends on the meaning of the word "present." It may mean either a condition and events actually subsisting when John wrote, or a dispensation of which that condition and those events formed a part—an indivisible unity embracing things then present. Here the word has both meanings, because the Churches to which it refers occupied a twofold position—on the one hand a literal, on the other a symbolical position. As seven individual Churches in Asia, those Churches had a literal position; and the words addressed to them had a literal application to their then present state. But in so far as they represented the Church Catholic—the true Sevenfold Unity in all times and places—their position was symbolical, and the words addressed to them applied not merely to their local and temporary condition, but to the whole phenomena of the Catholic Church during the whole of the Christian dispensation. And this view of the import and application of these epistles is in strict accordance with the whole analogy of Scripture. Not only were all the words and acts which God addressed literally to Israel of old applicable at once to the circumstances of Israel at the time, and to the future Christian Israel, but the prophecies of the Old Testament Canon, while occasioned by, and directed to, actual historical events under the former dispensation, have, not by accommodation or inference, but by divine intention, an application as direct, and yet more important, to the spiritual

events of the present dispensation. Now, no man can read these epistles without seeing that they were actually addressed to seven existing Churches for their benefit; but no man can read them without also seeing that their contents vastly transcend all merely local and temporary application. So is it always with the words of Him who seeth the end from the beginning, and of the Holy Ghost, who is the earnest of our inheritance, our Comforter and Monitor, till Christ shall come again. These epistles are the great catholic address of the risen Lord to the Church Catholic until the end of time. And while, as regards the seven special Churches addressed, the "present" ends, and the "future" commences, with the writing of John, yet, as regards the Church Catholic, the one ends, and the other begins, where, and in so far as, the dispensation of judgment succeeds the dispensation of grace.

If, however, this be so, it is plain that there must be a chronological succession as well as a contemporaneous breadth in the application of these epistles. Their contents evidently describe diverse features of character, which not only may, but must be, simultaneously discoverable at any given point in the inward history of the Church. Yet this does not exclude the fact that, even as outward events the most opposite may be at once befalling the Church Catholic in divers places, and predominating at successive periods, so her inward character may be at once diverse in place and successive in exhibition. This is rendered plain by the natural symbol of the rainbow, in which we have a simultaneous view of the sevenfold colours of the spectrum, and at the same time a field over which the eye can range in succession through the seven colours, each imperceptibly blended into, yet distinct from, those adjoining to it; and it is equally justified by the explicit interpretation of the seven heads, mountains, and kings, in Rev. xvii. 9. Not admitting such an application, we can hardly see the use of the epistles throughout the whole Christian dispensation, when we know from Church history how certain inward and outward characters have, in point of fact, successively predominated; whereas, admitting it, the progress of John from Ephesus round his diocese may well symbolize the successive aspects of the whole Catholic Church in the eyes of the Lord.*

* Indeed, not only the words of our Lord at the end of the Apocalypse (xxii. 16), "I have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things

Starting, then, from the principle that these epistles stand in chronological sequence as a biography of the Christian Church, we observe that each of them consists of five parts: 1. The title of the speaker; 2. The description of those addressed, for whose character, good or bad, the Angel, as the representative of Christ, is held responsible; 3. The exhortation; 4. The promise; 5. The call to observe what the Spirit saith. Of these parts, the promise—limited to him that stands the proof—refers to the world to come; the title assumed by Christ refers to one or more of His various attributes and offices as the risen Lord, eternal in their character indeed, yet applied to His present work in the Church; the exhortation is a practical one as to present duty; and the description, always commencing with notice of the good, even where ending with notice of the evil, is that to which the title, the exhortation, and the promise are all expressly adapted, so that by observing the one we can conclude as to the import of the others. Moreover, we find that, of the seven Churches, two—not the first, but the second and the sixth—are exclusively commended; and two, the fifth and seventh, are exclusively blamed. The commendation of certain persons in the fifth points them out as exceptions from a condition else wholly blameworthy; and the address to the fifth, as a corporate body, commencing with blame instead of praise, shows that there was little in it to praise.

These circumstances are, in the chronological application, of some importance. They show that the Church of the Apostolic age, so idolized by many who will not seek to imitate its good, soon fell into declension; that the end of this dispensation, instead of being the universal spread of the truth, shall exhibit apostasy; and that no true reformation can come save from God and through His proper ordinances. We also here find a proof that those two conditions in which the Church is purest are those of suffer-

in the churches," but more especially the solemn words with which each epistle is wound up, "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches," may serve to convince us that the Churches here addressed are symbolic of the whole in all ages. Each epistle, although addressed to one angel, is the saying of the Spirit to all the Churches. The Holy Spirit is the Comforter given till Jesus shall come again. The collective Church to which that Spirit speaks is composed not only of congregations in all places, but of saints in all generations; and as the Church at first presented simultaneously all the seven aspects described in the epistles, so are we warranted to expect a similar simultaneous exhibition at the end, when all her successive phases shall be gathered up into combination ere she appears in her final perfection.

ing for His Name who sent her into the world, and of waiting for His return. And the fact is not to be overlooked, that, as a type of the reward which awaits the faithful, Smyrna and Philadelphia are the only two Churches which can be said to survive at this day out of all the seven.

Lastly: The words, "He that hath an ear," limit the application of the epistles to those who have already received, and have not yet forfeited, the spiritual ear, and thus take for granted the survivance of grace and the possibility of return.

Without attributing any undue importance to the names of these seven Churches, yet, considering the symbolical character of these Churches, the pregnant meaning of names throughout all Scripture, from the narrative of creation downwards, and the truth that Providence ministers to the work of grace (so that, if we derive names from the intentions of man, we may, with at least equal warrant, derive them from the purposes of God), we cannot shut our eyes to the circumstance not only that each of the names of these seven Churches has a meaning, but that they are significant of certain conditions of the Christian Church which have historically succeeded each other in the same order as these names.

1. Ephesus, the first of the twelve Ionian cities of Asia, was, under the Greeks, distinguished for its trade, its luxury, its sorcery, and the splendour of its temple, dedicated to Artemis, called Diana Lucifera, often represented as having her head crowned with seven stars. This temple was supplanted by one almost as splendid, dedicated to the true God. The name Ephesus means "*desirable*"—an appropriate epithet for the Christian Church—the temple of the Living God, in which, as the body of Christ, He finds His good pleasure (εὐδοκία ἐν ἀνθρώποις, Luke ii. 14). Of the Church, as distinguished from the glory of the world, or the polluted fanes of the heathen, He says, by the mouth of the Psalmist, "This is my rest for ever; here will I dwell, for I have *desired* it" (Ps. cxxxii. 14). She, crowned with her bishops or angels, is the true Lucifera.*

2. Smyrna signifies "*myrrh*," the symbol of bitterness, grief, sorrow, and suffering; and this indicates a condition of persecution for Christ's sake, in which the Church fills up His sufferings in His Spirit of patience and love.

* Another meaning of Ephesus, "relaxing," may apply to the decay of its first love.

3. Pergamos signifies "*exaltation*," and thus indicates a condition in which the Church has exchanged the hatred of the world for its favour, contempt for honour, tribulation and poverty for ease and wealth.

4. Thyatira signifies "*toil of sacrifice*," and indicates a condition in which the Church, occupying an already recognized position in the world, prosecutes her daily routine of service, without the intervention of any marked era in her history, without either the freshness of love or the stimulus of hope.

5. Sardis signifies "*that which remains*," and indicates a condition in which the Church is reduced to spiritual poverty, whether consciously or unconsciously.

6. Philadelphia signifies "*love of brethren*," and indicates a condition in which the Church is distinguished by the mutual brotherly love of those who are in Christ.

7. Laodicea signifies "*popular judgment*," or judgment proceeding from the people, and indicates a condition of the Church in which men, standing, not in the name of Christ, but in their own name, usurp the place of God.

Now the most superficial acquaintance with Church history, of which the salient features are our surest guides, the least right estimate of the present time, and the least true understanding of scriptural announcements concerning the future, must suffice to present us with seven great chronological divisions of the Christian dispensation which bear precisely these characters and succeed each other in the very same order.

These are—1. The Apostolic age, from the foundation of the Church to the commencement of Roman persecution. 2. The times of persecution. 3. The time from the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Empire till the fall of the latter. 4. The interval between that fall and the Reformation. 5. The interval from the Reformation to the French Revolution. 6. The present time, in which God is restoring the Church. 7. The future time, in which He will desert and reject those who will not be restored.

The sequel will show the application of the above seven characters to these seven periods.

EPHESUS.

In every Church, the Lord, in His great charity, regards its good characteristics before the evil. In the Church at

Ephesus the good were, active labour, patience, perseverance, holy discipline, and spiritual discernment; the evil was decay of love. The labours of the Christian Church in the beginning were Herculean, in "turning men from darkness unto light, and from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts xxvi. 18). Her patience and perseverance were continually called into exercise, in weaning men from heathenish errors and vices, and surmounting the obstacles which impeded her work. Gathering those who, though awakened, were yet untaught and unchastened, she was kept, by her severe and impartial discipline, from being herself corrupted and ruined in the reception of those whom she was called to sanctify and save. Blessed through Apostolic ministry, filled with Apostolic tradition, and clinging with pertinacity round the Apostolic foundation, she was at once the fit subject of Satan's efforts to supply her with a pretended continuation of that Apostolic ministry which she saw gradually dying out, and the fit instrument for the detection of his wiles. The false coin was tendered to her, because she still valued and desired the true. It was tendered to her in vain, because she had and knew the true. She was able to detect and reject them that said they were Apostles, because she believed in and had those who were. She knew what true Apostles should do for her. By failure to do this the false were judged. Without faith in Apostles, such deliverance is not promised; without possession of Apostles, it cannot be wrought. And as the Church without Apostolic tradition was at the mercy of heresy, and without Apostolic succession at the mercy of schism, so, when God restores Apostles themselves to the Church, those parts of the Church which do not receive them shall be exposed to seduction by false Apostles, whom they cannot detect. Yet this Church at Ephesus had meanwhile left her love; not all her love, but that love which was the *first*; not that love which should enable her to continue with a measure of faithfulness in the world, but that love which, selling all things for Christ, never rests till it wins Him and attains perfection—that plerophory which, as with full sail and tide, carries us over every rock, quicksand, perilous passage, and pleasant anchorage, straight into the haven of the kingdom. That love she had lost; and, that being lost, it was in vain for her ministers to go up, like Reuben, to their father's bed. Having lost that first love, she was, in spite of all she had done, declared to have gone aside in the race and come short of the goal (ἐκπεπτωκας). She was called upon to consider, not what she had done and

been, but what she had failed to do and to be. The so-called primitive Church, the idol of the ecclesiastical antiquary, the *beau idéal* of those who would copy a thing that has been, instead of realizing a thing that shall be, is here charged with defect, with defect through sin—is contrasted with a yet higher thing, which she should have, but has not, exhibited—and is called to repent, as having forsaken the right way, instead of boasting as if she could show it. To man's eye she continues as she was. By God she is called to do her first works, on pain of removal, on pain of a judgment in many respects similar to that of the earthly Jerusalem which she had supplanted. And what was this removal? Not the total extinction of the light, but the removal of the candlestick. Not the destruction of its gold, not the extinction of the truth, but the detrusion of the Church, as the *θεοφορος*, from her proper and exclusive office as the exhibitor of that light. And not even her total detrusion, but the detrusion from her *proper place*; the continuance of the light with the Church, but the removal of the Church from that, her proper place, in which she should enlighten all, in which, filled with the whole counsel of God, and occupying the right attitude towards her own children and towards the children of this world, she should convey the light of God in the proper measure and manner for the guidance of all saints, in all places and times, and for the enlightening of all men. In so far as her place, her apprehension of her origin, office, and destiny, became untrue, in so far did she necessarily fail as the candlestick of God—in so far did the salt lose its savour. Her redeeming feature, however, lay in her still hating that which Christ hated—in her testimony for right and truth against wrong and falsehood—in her preservation of moral distinctions—in her resistance of those who, without formally teaching error, did the works (*εργα* not *διδασχην*) of the Nicolaitans, and who would thus practically convert Christian liberty into a fresh excuse for, and instrument of, licentiousness; in short, in her still preaching that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world. (Titus ii. 12.)

But if the Church was called to repent, the right way of repentance must have been indicated to her by the title of Him who thus called her, and the promises addressed to her. In these she was to find those attributes of Christ, by forgetting which she had fallen, and those future things, by letting which slip she had come short.

The Lord Jesus, in addressing this Church, styles Himself "He who holdeth fast the seven stars in His right hand, and who walketh about in the midst of the seven candlesticks, which are the golden." These seven stars are the angels or bishops of the seven Churches—the collective episcopate of the whole Catholic Church—not merely ministers, but representatives, of that Messenger of the Covenant in whom His saints delight, and who shall suddenly come to His temple. They are the symbols of His presence, who is the one object of that united love which binds us as one body to Him, and of that obedience which subjects us to one government and law; and they are the pledges of His speedy and sudden return to the Church, when He shall have finished His work in Heaven of building her up as the greater and more perfect tabernacle. (Mal. iii. 1; Heb. ix. 11.) Yet they are thus symbols of the one, and pledges of the other, not as self-sufficient, but as held fast by Christ—not as separate, but as held in one hand—not as supreme, but as held in the right hand of the Lord, as sustained in their place by His authority and supply of grace through Apostles—through those who are the Benjamin, the son of the right hand (Gen. xxxv. 18)—through that right hand which is full of righteousness, which planted God's vineyard, from which goeth forth His fiery law, in which is saving strength, and which shall find out all His enemies. He whose way is in the sanctuary, and whose feet are as fine brass, walketh about in all parts of the Catholic Church, using His right hand of apostleship and His left hand of prophecy for the ordering and blessing of His house. And in that measure in which the seven candlesticks are the golden—in that measure in which the Churches abide in the truth, and are filled with the same, and purified by the chastisement of sons—in that measure do they form the fit theatre for the shining of His light, clear the way for His holy footsteps, and enable Him to go whither He willeth, and do what He desireth, as the Great High Priest of good things to come. Such are the special attributes of Christ, by the exercise of which the labours of Ephesus should have been crowned in reaching the goal, and her decaying love should have been revived in the assurance of His presence, power, and guidance, and in the hope of His appearing. The stars in the right hand indicate a time when Apostles still ruled the Church and sustained her ministries.

With these titles the promise agrees: "To the conquering will I give to eat from the tree of life which is in the

midst of the paradise of God." To "him that is found conquering," not to him who, having ceased to conquer, lives on the memory of former victory. And he shall eat, not of fruit growing on trees of this world, not on the earthly results of his labours, but of fruit from the tree of life. Neither of that fruit, indefinite in manner or kind, growing at random and vaguely supplied, but of twelve fruits, completing the circle of the year, the fruits of Christ through a twelvefold Apostleship. Neither growing in the world that is, but in the midst of the paradise of God, the archetype of the garden of the Hesperides, to which the cherubim, revealing Christ's glory, point the way. Nor yet matured by earthly nurture, but growing in the midst of the street of the city, on either side of the pure river of the water of life, shining as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb. Such is that heavenly entertainment after fasting and toil, the expectation of which is to close our lips against all premature and earthly refreshment—such that hope of seeing twelve Apostles as the stewards of the future feast, by which we should be preserved in their absence from inferior and disorderly supply—such the place where we shall be fed; not the waste of the wilderness, not the palace of an earthly monarch, not the snug refectory of the cloister or the parlour of the rectory, but the city which hath foundations, where moth and rust corrupt not, where thieves steal not, where nothing shall hurt or destroy;—such the source of our refreshment, communion with the Father and the Son—such the divine reward of patient, persevering work—such the divine recipe for the revival of decaying love.

SMYRNA.

The Church of Smyrna receives commendation unmingled with rebuke. Her characters are tribulation, poverty (coupled with true riches), blasphemy from false brethren, and the prospect of trial, for a definite time, by imprisonment and death. It is well known that while God in His mercy did, with certain exceptions, grant to the Church in the beginning a measure of outward peace, such as was needful for the going out of His words to the end of the world (Rom. x. 18), the time came when the prosecution of Apostolic labours was attended with diverse and bitter, though

often local and temporary, forms of suffering, both in life and in estate; and when by these, those who enjoyed wealth, ease, and reputation were deterred from confessing Christ, while those who confessed Him were reduced to the most abject worldly distress, in one point of view as a just punishment for the declensions of the Church, but in another as a trial and signal illustration of her faith in a better portion. We know that the Christians were branded as Atheists by the heathen, and that the literal Jews who, like evil spirits, everywhere followed or preceded the Gospel with slanders and machinations, gladly lent their sanction to this accusation; and we also know that at this period there appeared in the midst of the spiritual Israel, the Christian Church, ecclesiastical bodies infected with heresy and addicted to schism, who, by their errors and divisions, both perplexed the minds of the inquiring and stimulated the rage of the hostile, and who, usurping to themselves the title of the true Church, added sorrow to the sufferings of the faithful, by denouncing *them* as heretics and schismatics. These bodies were especially they who said "that they *themselves* were Jews;" and these were the first "synagogue of Satan" of which we read. The Nicolaitans of the former epistle, although servants of Satan, had not yet become his synagogue. They were separate in spirit and conduct, but not in fact, from the Church. They were her grief, but not her rivals. Satan is the opposer. A synagogue is a constituted body, claiming an ecclesiastical existence, and exhibiting ecclesiastical ordinances of its own. A synagogue of Satan is a church or a society of churches, perverting the standing, doctrine, and ordinances of the Church to Satan's service. As Peter was called Satan by the Lord, when he gave good counsel wrongly applied, so do we find all good and divine things in the Church, when Satan perverts them, called things of Satan. In the Apocalypse we read, first of the *synagogue* of Satan, then of his *throne*, then of his *abode*, then of his *depths*; and we shall see in the sequel that each of these terms designates not merely a particular form of falsehood and wickedness set up openly against truth and holiness, but a subtle abuse of divine institutions to Satan's service. Here the synagogue of Satan afflicts the Church in Smyrna, not by stimulating persecution, but by adding to the temporal sufferings of persecution the spiritual sufferings of heresy and schism. And it is notorious that the period which intervened between the Apostolic age and the Christianization of the Roman Empire was one in which the Church suffered under the

combination of spiritual and temporal affliction. The latter of the two, however—*i.e.*, persecution—was the more prominent and peculiar feature, and more directly threatened the extinction of the truth by the professed purpose of the Roman emperors to extirpate the race which held it. While Tacitus, Suetonius, Pliny, and Lucian ransacked their vocabulary for opprobrious epithets by which to designate the blasphemy, licentiousness, and treason, the cruelty, folly, and devilry of which the Christians were accused, a Roman emperor stamped his medals "*Nomine Christiano deleto.*" In the so-called "ten persecutions," or rather in the ten years of the last—a year for a day—to which the wavering Diocletian was incited by the Devil through the oracle of Apollo, in the "ten days" of tribulation, man did his worst to undo, not that creation which was finished in seven days, but the new creation of God. In these the children of this world, unable to rob the heirs of their kingdom, strove to rob the kingdom of its heirs. The Prince of darkness appeared, not as Satan—Σατανας—not as a rival and opponent, but as the Devil—Διαβολος—the accuser. He accused the brethren before the tribunal of the powers that were. The Lord shall yet cast him down, when he shall arise in all his characters (that of dragon as fallen angel, that of serpent as deceiver of man, that of devil as accuser, and that of Satan as opposer) (Rev. xii. 9, 10) to accuse the saints before *God*. But the Lord then left unanswered the accusation of the saints before *man*. And the saints who had cherished the hope of being soon received into the paradise of God and the palace of their Heavenly King, found themselves cast first into prison, and, if that did not shake their fidelity, into death—cut off from hope, and deprived, as by a gaoler's bolt, of all liberty to serve either God or men. Yet all this could proceed no farther than God permitted it to go. The suffering and captivity of the Church, during which her Beloved was indeed "a bundle of myrrh" unto her (Song i. 13), was no argument for despair, but a divine trial whether she could believe against sense in His love, and hope against hope in His promises. She was in the hands indeed of men, but in the furnace of God. She suffered not by chance, she was not tried without an object, and she did not endure unrewarded. She had been taught that the powers that be are the ordinance of God. She had been told that if she would do that which was right she would have praise of the same. (Rom. xiii. 13.) God tried her faith by suffering her persecution for a time at

the hands of those who should have praised her. But when He had so done, He fulfilled His word. And, as the captive Joseph was recognized and exalted by Pharaoh, so was the heart of Imperial Rome turned to recognize the Church as the great doer of that which was right in the earth, and to give her the due meed of praise by exalting Christianity to be the religion of the State. Nay, we may carry the analogy still further, and apply the sure word of promise to the future also. The time is at hand when Satan shall not only use the powers that be to persecute the truth, but actually possess them. There is a Satanic possession of ordinances and institutions as of persons. We should ever pray that Satan may not be suffered to enter the powers that be. But we read that the "kings shall yet give their power to the beast," and thus be incapable of praising those who serve Christ. Yet when that trial of faith, more severe than any through Imperial Rome, shall be past, we shall see the promise more gloriously fulfilled than ever, by the kings of the earth bringing their glory and honour into the New Jerusalem. (Rev. xxi. 24.) The acknowledgment of Christianity by the Roman State was indeed a mere earthly reward, which might, and which (received in an earthly spirit, as a substitute for her true and final reward) did, become the worst snare that has ever taken her feet, inasmuch as she was seduced to accept that as her portion which God gave to sustain her in patient waiting for her true portion. But in itself it was a reward from God, a symbol and foreshowing of the time when they who suffer with Christ shall also reign with Him. And to this true reward—that most appropriate to her character as the afflicted and holy One—both the title of the Lord and the terms of His promise distinctly point.

He calls Himself "the First and the Last," He who became (ἐγενέτο) dead and became alive. He promises that "he which overcometh shall not be hurt of that death which is the second." The Son of God was before all powers that can assail the Church, and He shall be after them. He was the starting-point, and shall be the goal. From the harbour of His grace we have set sail, and to the haven of His mercy we shall return. Before and behind He compasseth us with salvation. He goeth before, and is our rereward. And as, for love to God and to us, He consented to die—as He who is the life became dead, and, while men thought His case lost and His course run out, was merely passing through the gate of death into eternal resurrection,—so shall

all they who will lose their life for His sake assuredly come alive again as He did—He as the first-fruits, they at the resurrection of the just. Before honour is humility. The whole Christian dispensation is our time of preparation through humility for honour. And when God saw fit to quicken the faith and hope of the Church, in waiting for her honour at the second coming of Christ, by exalting her to honour in this world, through the fiat of an earthly king, He brought her first through the valley of the shadow of death, purging the dross and proving the gold in the fire of persecution. But the promise goes yet further. He that overcometh the world, conquering by dying in the faith of resurrection, shall thereby escape a second and greater evil. There is a second death—second, because it succeeds a first—second, because it touches them who have been delivered from the first—second, because it destroys a new and better life, bestowed in the second Adam on those who had forfeited natural life in the first. The second death is the dreadful end of the unfaithful baptized. The admonition of the Lord is, “not to fear them which can kill the body, and after that have no more which they can do, being not able to kill the soul, but to fear Him who, after He hath killed, hath power to cast into hell, and thus to destroy both body and soul” (Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4). The sword and tortures of heathen Rome could do no more than kill the body; the delusions of the last Antichrist can kill the soul. Man can sentence the separation of soul and body, but God can sentence the eternal separation of both from Him. And the saints who suffered for Christ not merely were thereby secured, by resting from their labours, against the possibility of falling upon those evil days when men shall be deluded by the Man of Sin, but had in the very reason of their sufferings the assurance that they were not subjects of the second death.

PERGAMOS.

The Church at Pergamos is distinguished, first, by *its abode*, where the *throne* of Satan is; and then by its holding fast (*ῥαπτεῖς*) the name of Christ, and not denying His faith, during a certain period in which a faithful witness of Christ was killed, where Satan had *his abode*. And it is blamed,

first, for having *there* (*i.e.*, in Satan's abode and round his throne) those who hold fast (*κρατοῦντας*) the teaching of Balaam, who seduced Israel to unlawful food and adultery; and secondly, for itself also having (*καὶ σὺ*) those who hold fast (*κρατοῦντας*) the teaching (*διδασχὴν*) of the Nicolaitans.

What are here the throne and the abode of Satan? All power is of God. All government used for God is God's throne. Used against Him, it becomes that of Satan. Following the canon of interpretation, derived from our Lord's words to Peter and from the meaning of the name itself, the throne of Satan, in the text, is a spiritual government perverted into a carnal form, and thus antagonist to the very cause which, if it had not been thus transmuted, it should have prospered. On the same principle, the abode of Satan is the abode of those who manifest and carry out that perversion of true principles on which false government is based. In other words, we see here the secularization of divine ecclesiastical government, and the consequent secularization of the spirit of the Church. This comes to pass in one or both of two ways—*viz.*, the assumption of a worldly position, character, and object by the Church, and the subjection of the Church to the civil power. Of these evils the former has been most manifest in the Papacy, the latter in those Churches which (having cast off its quasi-secular government without receiving a better in its stead) have fallen almost invariably into the arms of the State. Yet, ever since the conversion of the Roman Empire to Christianity (paradoxical though the phenomenon may seem), we really find both forms of the evil exhibited at once, with varied measures of predominance. The Bishop of Rome, forgetting that the Church is but the hidden germ of a future and heavenly polity, set up a throne of Satan by claiming and (after the manner of this world) enforcing a universal dominion, under which he sought to bring the Emperor. And the Emperor, ignorant as to the heavenly standing of the Church, took her into deadly embrace, and thus made his rule more the throne of Satan to her than if he had been her oppressor. The Church mistook for prosperous elevation the greatest and most perilous descent she ever made, from serving in Heaven to ruling prematurely on earth, ruling before Christ, and therefore without Him—nay, against Him, as an Antichrist. And the State found in the conduct of the Church herself the warrant for treating her as an earthly institution. Thus, missing that harmonious union of two independent integers which constitutes the true place, favours the operation, and

insures the health of both, they exhibited a mixture which disturbed and corrupted both, in which Satan found his *government*, in so far as God was disappointed of His, and Satan found his *abode*, in so far as the people of God were not in the position which He intended for them. Yet these evils, although internally injurious, were in themselves of an external origin and form. The faithful in the Church were still able, in spite of the contrary temptation, to hold fast that name which Christ has above every name, Emperor's or Pope's, in a spiritual controversy yet deeper than that of Arius and Athanasius. Their faith in Him, as the source of all power, protection, blessing, and judgment, was weakened indeed, yet not destroyed, by the interposition of man, either arrogating the attributes (instead of exercising, as he should, the functions) of Christ, or smothering, under secular regulation, the life of the saints. They yet saw the sun through the clouds, or at least knew his existence, and could guess his place. The time was not yet come, indeed, for those who witnessed against such departure from the ways of God to be slain before the *throne* of Satan, as obnoxious to the existing authorities; but Antipas was, nevertheless, slain where Satan *dwelt*. The spirits and visions of men were filled with the great idols of Church and State. The testimonies of Christ's own presence were at a discount; and the life of God in man, which by these alone can be sustained, was smitten, starved, and moribund.

Analogous to this condition of things were the two sins charged against Pergamos. Balaam, whether a false prophet or rather a true prophet abusing his gift, and employed by Moab to curse and seduce Israel, is a type of the prostitution of Christian ministry and gifts so as to justify the lawless against the right way of the Lord, and induce the faithful to transfer their allegiance from God to idols, and their affection from Christ to others—to identify themselves with a system erected professedly in the name of Christ, but really in the name and to the glory of men, and to love the favour of men, and sacrifice virtue for their gifts. We see in him the embryo of the false prophet at the time of the end. "Thou hast them *there*," points to the abode of Satan and the site of his throne as the theatre of the sin; and "*who hold fast*," points to the authority by which this sin was supported. It was a sin not directly committed by the faithful. It was not the angel of Pergamos, but they whom he had there, that committed it. Yet it was a sin, for the permission of which he was responsible, and not the less so that it may have been

permitted through lack of spiritual discernment and watchfulness. Moreover, the deeds of the Nicolaitans—once condemned by the Church—the fruits of that false spirituality in which the Gnostics regarded the body as worthy of nothing better than to be given up to its lusts—these wicked deeds had now a doctrine to back them, a doctrine promulgated with authority—and not only promulgated by others, but suffered by Him. In short, these two sins shortly express the three great prevailing and public sins of the Church: the honouring of those who stood in ordinances instead of Him in whose ordinances they stood, the dalliance of the Church with earthly lovers and protectors, and the prostitution of grace, by indulgences and otherwise, to the encouragement of vice.

Of these sins this Church was called to repent, on pain of being waged war against (*πολεμῆσω*) by the Lord “with the sword, or revolving blade” (*ρομφαίᾳ*) of “His mouth.” He was to wage war against her—not merely to judge as Lord, but to make war as Lord of Hosts, followed by His hosts, by His glorified saints, by the armies of Heaven. (Rev. xix. 14.) And He was to do so with the revolving blade of His mouth, not with the mere sword of Constantine (although the title of the Lord may point at this), not with the sword of single combat in His right hand, but with that weapon of vengeance, that sharp sword with two edges which John saw in His mouth (Rev. i. 16)—that sword with which the remnant who make war against Him shall be slain, when their leaders are cast into the lake (Rev. xix. 21)—that fiery word of judgment which shall lay waste and devour on every hand. This is the thing threatened—the judgment of the Lord at His second coming on the developed heads and assembled hosts of antichristian apostasy. But how could the Church at Pergamos come to be exposed to this? The answer is alike simple and solemn. By failing to eradicate the above-mentioned sins. These are the sins which, if suffered, will ripen and unfold into the abominations and blasphemies of the last Antichrist. The transference of allegiance from Christ to man—the willing to be the *protégé* and the friend of the world—the combination of the ministry of grace with continuance in sin. These are the three great moral evils in which Antichrist, who continueth not in the Father and the Son, takes birth, and is cradled and nourished up to final revelation. The mystery of iniquity is as old and as deep as the mystery of godliness. The mediæval Church concealed, indeed, the full lineaments

of the Devil's spawn, but he was even then as an embryo within her. And not by chance, or as the too severe punishment of intellectual mistake, but as the condign and exactly adapted recompense of spiritual transgression and moral turpitude, shall apostate Christians, persisting in *ανομία*, receive from God strong delusion to hail the *ἀνομος* as the true Messiah.

Therefore does the Lord take the title of Him "that hath the revolving blade—the two-edged—the sharp." He, the true High Priest—He, the King of kings—He who wields both temporal and spiritual power on earth—consecrator of prelates, crowner of emperors—He, the Apostle and Prophet, the Thummim and Urim of God, the true Samson, the true Hercules, or Lion of God—He, the Word, whose word shall judge that Church which prematurely judges the world, and whose kingdom shall abolish all her bastard forestalments—He, who will not adopt into His armies the motley levies of man, but only the called, and chosen, and faithful—He, who will reduce to ruins the stateliest temple not cemented with His mortar, and turn into volcanoes and cast into the sea all mountains not set fast of Him—*He* it is who speaketh! And how runs His promise? He will "give to eat of *that* manna which is the hidden" (τοῦ κρυπμένου). And He will "give a white stone, on which is written a *new* name, which none but the receiver knoweth." By these words He would warn the Church against those very snares into which she fell when she became recognized of the State—viz., sustenance by an earthly provision, and comfort in the favour of men. That manna which, left by the dew, was daily found and consumed by the people of Israel, is the type of the presence of Christ—the Bread of Life—with us by the Holy Ghost. And that "manna which is the hidden," is something more. It points to the pot of manna which was laid up for all generations in the Holiest of all, Christ—the Bread of Life—gone into Heaven, to come forth again. Seated in heavenly places in Him—eating Him—living by Him as He by the Father—having meat to eat that the world knoweth not of—and exercising, in the constant enjoyment of that wealth which is at God's right hand, the self-denial of our father Abraham, who would not let man make him rich,—the Church ought to have been preserved from consenting to be either the pensioner of kings, or a grasping tax-gatherer, enforcing her claims before human tribunals. And had she remembered the words, "He shall be great in the sight of the Lord," and "whose praise is not

of men," or the appeal of Paul from the judgment of man's day to the judgment-seat of Christ, as the only place from which he would accept commendation, she would have shut her ear to all the blandishments of man, and her eye to all his gifts and gewgaws; waiting for that white stone of acquittal on which is written the passport of God, "Well done, good and faithful servant;" waiting for that new name known to none but the receiver—our fellowship with Jesus, the accepted One—our citizenship in the New Jerusalem, into which none but citizens shall enter; waiting for that joy which no stranger shall share, and the glory of which shall be hidden by the jasper wall of the city from the gaze, longing or profane, of all that are without. Truly, by such great and precious promises, the Church should have been partaker of the divine nature, escaping the corruption that is in the world through lust; so filled and satisfied with God, as to lust after nothing on earth. Alas! what a proverb has she, what a proverb have her priests, become for the reverse!

THYATIRA.

Roman Catholic

The commendable features of the Church in Thyatira are, her love, her service or deaconship (*διακονίαν*), her faith, her patient waiting, and the increasing number of her works. That which is blamed is the allowing the woman, or, as some read it, "thy wife," Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to seduce, by her teaching, Christ's servants into fornication, and the eating of things sacrificed to idols. The "toil of sacrifice" well expresses the good works of this Church. We are ourselves a living sacrifice. All our works for God in His house do but carry this out; and we have a constant duty to present to God the great memorial of Christ's sacrifice. While the self-righteous and the superstitious weary themselves with sacrifices which are not well-pleasing to God, the proper business of a church walking in the liberty of the Spirit is the hard labour and self-sacrifice of willing and joyful obedience, and the constant celebration of divine worship. After the conflict of the Church for her existence had ceased, and her ministrations had permeated—nay, fashioned—all the institutions of the civilized world, while the unfaithful only the more successfully pursued their

worldly objects, the faithful found to their hand the requisite ecclesiastical machinery and social position for constantly plying their religious work, and going unhindered and undeterred through the routine of their holy avocations. Pastoral love, philanthropic compassion, peacemaking, mediation, wise counsel, useful industry, solid education, enlarged civilization, maintenance of truth, guarding of heavenly mysteries, development of holy worship, exercise of divine discipline, and patient endurance of the brutality, worldliness, hypocrisy, or rebellion of man, shine brightly forth during those so falsely called "dark ages" which preceded the sixteenth century. And if the *first works* of the Church in evangelizing the Roman Empire were great, *her last works*, in bringing to the obedience of Christ the rude hordes that settled on its ruins, were undoubtedly much greater. But Christ had one thing against her, that she suffered Jezebel—not that she approved of her, but that, as Pergamos was to blame in suffering the doctrine of Balaam and the Nicolaitans in high places, so was Thyatira to blame in suffering the teaching of this woman, in whom seduction was embodied, as faithful testimony had been embodied in Antipas. Who, then, is this Jezebel, and what is her work? The literal Jezebel, the daughter of the idolatrous Ethbaal, the imperious wife of Ahab the king, the wife who used her husband's signet for her own wickedness, fitly typified that attitude of the Church in which she usurps the authority of Christ to do evil, and contained the embryo of Babylon at the time of the end, as Balaam did of the false prophet. The idolatry of the Blessed Virgin is the patent sign of the latent sin which assigns this false position to the Church. The Church claims honour on the ground of being used to bring forth the manifestation of God, and then, stealing that honour, she uses it to override the authority of Christ. As the woman contrasted with the man, the Church should keep silence that He may speak. Though He speaks *by* her, yet He is the prophet, not she. The Church is not the prophetess, but Christ alone the prophet, whom men must hear on pain of spiritual death. He is the teacher. He suffereth not a woman to teach; yea, though she be endowed with every gift and grace. Though He teaches *by the Church*, the teaching *of the Church* (that arrogant phrase which is ever in the mouths of Church-idolizing men) is a thing which He does not know. If *she* teaches, she must be teaching her own things and in her own name. If she teaches as a prophetess, she is called a

prophetess *by herself*; and what she does thus teach, in so false a position, must engender error. She cannot use the doctrine of ordinances to usurp the place of Christ, without abusing those ordinances themselves to mislead men. In a word, by decretals and otherwise, she stamps as doctrines of the Church those practical errors which had before been committed merely by certain of her rulers, and she stealthily feeds idolatry in the ignorant. While the Eastern Church bowed to an emperor, the Western adopted Pagan superstitions.

What, then, does the Lord here predict and enjoin? He predicts, first, the fate of Jezebel, then that of her lovers, and then that of her children—all induced by the same cause, yet all diverse in character. He predicts that when she shall be found impenitent at the expiry of the space granted to her for repentance, He will, by casting her, palsied and corrupt as it were, upon a death-bed, make an example of her, to deter all others in whom the like wickedness lurks. He predicts that if they who shared and helped her guilt shall not repent of their works when they see her fate, He will cast them into *great* tribulation, and will kill with death (*ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ*) the children whom she has thus unlawfully borne: by all which all Churches shall learn that no wicked counsel or sinful affection can be deeply hidden or speciously disguised from Him; that every Church shall be judged, not by its creeds, its orders, or its rites, but by its fruits; that no ecclesiastical denomination can be a passport through that gate where every man must give account of himself; and that none shall stand the light but they whose works are wrought in God. The space granted for repentance is evidently that during which a church which has abused her stewardship should learn a salutary lesson, by the disclosure of her malpractices, and by the protest of men against them, such as that which the sixteenth century ushered in, and the present sees out; wherein we see, not the sins of Rome alone, but our own also—not the fruits of Romanism alone, but those of all unfaithfulness. We have yet to see Jezebel stretched, ghastly and corrupt, upon her bed of sickness; we have yet to see whether the wise, the rich, the mighty of the earth, when they behold her, will repent or not. If they do, God will give them to admire and follow the chaste bride of the Lamb, and to receive her heavenly Bridegroom; but if they do not, they shall be cast, not into such tribulation merely as Smyrna suffered, or as other ages of the world have seen, but into great (*μεγαλην*) tribulation

—into that tribulation, the great—(την θλίψιν την μεγάλην, Rev. vii. 14) the like of which neither was, nor shall be; that energy of error which shall cause men to believe a lie (2 Thess. ii. 12), that tyranny of Antichrist under which all who have not held the Head shall groan. And all the bastard race begotten of unholy union between the Church and the mighty of this world shall be killed with death—shall have the new life in Christ extinguished in them by the second death. Nor is the Lord partial. He saith to the faithful, as well as to the unfaithful, “I will give to every one of *you* according to your works.” With this they must lay their account; and there shall be a remnant (οἱ λοιποὶ) prepared to stand the test.

But how shall this remnant be known? Hereby, that they have not the doctrine of Jezebel, and have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak (τα βάθη τοῦ Σατανᾶ, αἷς λεγουσιν). We have already seen what the doctrine of Jezebel is; but what are these depths of Satan? and why is it added, “as they speak”? It is plain that “as they speak,” or profess, cannot apply to “Satan.” No falsehood professes to be falsehood—no work of Satan professes to be his. The words must, therefore, mean that these things professed to be “depths,” and are really depths; but depths of Satan, not of God. Depths are mysteries hidden from mankind at large, and revealed to the initiated. The depths of God are not the inscrutable mysteries of the Divine essence—which none but God Himself can know—but those mysteries of God which are hidden from the world, yet revealed to the saints, to the members of Christ, to those who have fellowship with the Father and the Son, to those who have that Spirit of God who knoweth the things of God. In short, they are that truth of which the Church is pillar and ground. From the beginning, therefore, the Church has known the depths of God. As her history proceeded, as her circumstances altered, as her experience was varied and enlarged, she should have known more of these depths. Whatever falsehood may lie in applying the theory of development to justify all the novelties and errors of the Church, or to justify those works of the flesh which she may have wrought instead of the works of Christ, the theory of development in itself is a true one—one which should have been, and has in many things been, realized by fresh grace of the Comforter, in the progressive enlargement and application of the truth; and the Church, with whatever lack of freshness, and with whatever admixture of error, probably knew more depths of God in

subsequent centuries than at the beginning. But as it is required of us not only to live and begin in the Spirit, but to walk and be made perfect in the Spirit, so we must not only know the depths of God, but use them to God's glory. Where we do not—where we pervert them, either in form or in application, they become depths of Satan. The divine origin of ordinances, doctrines, and rites, if they are exercised and applied impurely, makes them only the mightier engines of Satan. The Church of the middle ages boasted with justice that she knew the depths of God. But she did not use them aright; therefore they became depths of Satan. And her boast that they were really depths only proclaimed how much greater was her guilt than if she had done Satan's work with other instruments which were not depths of God. They, therefore, who abide together in the communion of the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, yet have no fellowship with or share in such prostitution of the most sacred things, are the true remnant.

And what is promised to this remnant? The promise is peculiar. Elsewhere we see a joint threatening of judgment in this world and judgment in the next; here we see a joint promise of reward in this world and of reward in the next. Both rewards are made to depend on their holding that which they have, and keeping Christ's words till He shall come. And in this respect the epistle to Thyatira and that to Philadelphia have a common element which distinguishes them from the rest—namely, the coming of Christ as the sole termination of their labours; although Philadelphia again is distinguished from Thyatira by being the only Church in which a crown is represented as immediately awaiting the labourers. The promise pertaining to this world is here, that Christ will lay on them no other burden—observe, not *no different* (ετερον), but *no other* (αλλο). This implies that they had already borne, or were bearing, a burden, the faithful bearing of which should exempt them from any other, from any repetition of the burden in a new or worse form, until Christ should come. This certainly did not mean that the Church, called to await the coming of Christ, should by faithfulness at one past period be exempted from all obligation to subsequent fidelity; and still less that there should be any period preceding the Second Advent of the Lord in which the faithful should have no burden to bear. It is evidently meant that, even as the Jews who received John were virtually receiving Christ, so in bearing the burden of Jezebel the Church was virtually bearing another which should rise out

of, and be the development of it ; and that her faithfulness in bearing the first burden was such as would have enabled her to bear the second, had God's time come for requiring that second to be borne. Now the first burden which she did bear was the work of refusing to have Jezebel's doctrine, and refusing to know or symbolize with the perversion of divine mysteries to the service of Satan, the opponent of the way of the Lord. And whereas we read of a second burden, we know that the abuses of the middle ages are not the last, worst, and final form of evil in the Church. Papal abuses are but the first foreshowings of antichristian blasphemies. There is another and heavier burden coming than the resistance of those ; and yet they are the embryo, so to speak, out of which it shall arise. We can be at no loss to know what this heavier burden is. It is the revelation and reign of Antichrist, with all those false doctrines and works, with all those caricatures of the deepest mysteries concerning God and the Church, which shall precede and accompany it, so as to deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. Be they right or wrong who have called the Papacy or the Reformation respectively the Antichrist of their day, *neither is the Antichrist with whom we have to do, and neither can preserve us from him.* And yet his parentage may be legitimately derived from evils previously manifested in the Church, some in one section, some in others. Now the great lesson of our text is this : that they who are found faithful in the especial work, positive and negative, to which Thyatira is called—*i.e.*, in the full and faithful exhibition and use of Christian mysteries and ordinances as divine institutions, together with the faithful protest against their corruption, abolition, or prostitution—do all that God requires of His children and servants ; and so doing, will assuredly, when the great time of temptation comes, receive from Him their reward, in such discernment and strength as to detect, escape, and overcome the universal delusion. This view is remarkably confirmed by that remaining half of the promise which pertains to the world to come. It consists of two parts. The one part is authority (*ἐξουσίαν*) over the nations—the ruling of them with a rod of iron, and the breaking of them as potters' vessels, as Christ Himself had received of His Father ; the other part is the gift of the Star, which is the morning one—or the Branch—the shooting forth of light and life. (Zech. iii. 8 ; vi. 12.) And both parts point to the distinction between Christ, whom this Church serves, and Antichrist, whom she escapes. Christ has sent us into the world as the Father sent

Him. We shall sit on His throne, as He on the Father's; and He shall make us assessors in the judgment committed by the Father unto Him. Because *He* shall have authority over the lawless nations, who rage like the waves of the sea driven with winds, we shall have it; because He shall wield the rod of iron force over those who would not kiss the sceptre of love, we shall too; because He shall break the marred vessels of grace, we shall too. We shall do so because we have asserted that Antichrist hath no authority—because we have defied his rule—because we have refused his judgment; and we shall receive the true Morning Star, because we have disowned Lucifer, son of the morning.

Hence, too, the emphasis of the title assumed by the Lord; not only He who is the Son of God—*i.e.*, the Son of Man declared the Son of God with power, by resurrection from the dead, as Head of the Church—not only He whose eyes are as a flame of fire to discern the spirit of His Church, and whose feet are as fine brass, exhibiting His holy ways in the sanctuary; but He who is “the Son of God” as distinguished from him who pretends to be the Son of God, but who shall be man, and not God, in the hand of Him that slayeth him—He whose eyes shall discern and detect that huge imposture of self-deifying humanity which shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect—He who under the soles of whose feet the wicked shall be as ashes, when He shall leave the Father's throne and come down to claim His own. All this is part of what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.

SARDIS.

—Protestantism

God is no respecter of persons. If the epistle which we have just considered seems to bear hard on the Papacy, that on which we now enter does so no less on the Churches of the Reformation. They who say “Amen” to the one will be proved whether they are mere partisans or truly catholic by being required to say “Amen” to the other also. And nothing shows more clearly how blind Protestants are to the true defects of their position, than the attempt which has been made to appropriate Philadelphia to the Reformation, by compressing into one Thyatira and Sardis, as two successive phases of Papacy, and to appropriate all true reforma-

tion and the vision of those who stand on Mount Zion to the Anglican Church alone.

The sin of the Church in Sardis is that of having the reputation of life, while really dead; and its death is the consequence of its undervaluing divine succession and ordinances. Christ is our life. If we cut ourselves off from Him, we shall die. But He bestows on, and nourishes in, us the life of God by a certain instrumentality of men and ordinances, by ministers and means of grace. As we may not pass by Him to hold direct of the Father, so we may not intentionally pass by them to hold direct of Him. They who seek Him thus do not find Him. They may find an imagined spirituality, but they do not find that edifying of one body through joints and bands which is the only true edifying. And while they flatter themselves that they are drawing more largely, because, as they say, directly and exclusively, from the Head, and are reputed most spiritual, they are really in a position in which their life must either ebb to death, or be supported by fevering stimulants, or be supplanted by mere galvanism.

And how large and deep is the exhortation to which this one sin gives occasion! "Become one who is watching, and strengthen the remaining things which are about to die; for I have not found thy works fulfilled before God. Remember, therefore, *how* thou hast received and heard, and preserve (τηρει), and repent. Therefore, if thou dost not watch, I will come upon thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know at what hour I shall come upon thee." The Churches which, following up the Theses of Feldkirchen in 1516, cast off the abuses, and thus forfeited the communion, of Rome, neither "remembered" nor "preserved." They fell into the grievous mistake of thinking that no more was necessary in order to be at once restored to the excellence of the primitive Church; and imagining that the mystery of godliness and the mystery of wickedness were already fulfilled, they expected the end of the world, without a suspicion of their utter unpreparedness for that awful event, or of the dark passage and fierce conflict which lay between. They mistook simplicity for spiritual fulness, and laboured merely to return to a past condition, which, with all its excellencies, was not the perfect one, instead of pressing forward to perfection hitherto unattained. The remark of a living writer as to those who would retrace their steps may well be applied to them: "They revisit the places through which they had passed in the morning light; but it is now with

wearied limbs, and under the gloomy shades of evening." They thought their works perfect; subsequent generations have idolized them as perfect. But Christ has not found them perfect before God. He has not found them the fulfilment of all that the Father had commissioned Him to do in and through the Church. The Protestant Churches were anything but the ten-stringed harp on which the true David should sound, in their full volume, the praises of God. They thought they pleased Him entirely, when in many things they greatly hindered Him. Their vanity deserved the rebuke. Their self-delusion as to the true character of their state is only exceeded by that of the Church in Laodicea, of which we shall see that it is yet more satisfied with itself, and has still less cause to be so. They thought that they had done their work, and they no longer kept *awake* in the night season, either to fight with their real enemy, or to cry for the coming kingdom. They had, indeed, realized the name of Sardis, "*that which remains.*" With the rubbish and filth, they had also, through lack of the lawful commission and consequent grace to separate the precious from the vile, cast out so much that was precious, as to leave well-nigh a minimum behind. They retained little more than a few fundamental truths—in some cases not even these. While they rejoiced over their pure remainder, they little dreamed that it was about to die; and even if aware of its decay, they knew neither the cause of the decay, nor the way to arrest and heal it. Therefore the Lord says to the angel (for Protestants have a divine ministry), "Strengthen the things that remain." How? "Therefore," that is, if thou wouldest really and effectually strengthen them, "remember how thou hast received,"—"remember how thou hast heard, and preserve it." In other words, haste thou back, not only to Apostolic doctrine, but to Apostolic grace and power—not only to Apostolic simplicity, but to Apostolic fulness—not only to Christ the Saviour of sinners, but Christ the Head of the body, the Giver of the Holy Ghost. Let this be the heading, the central clause, and the ending of thy charter. Turn wholly from thine own ways to those of God. What shall it avail thee to call thy truth fundamental, if thou thyself art not on the foundations? The Church is not built on truths. What shall it avail to fabricate ordinances? They must be perfected by the Head, else they are wells without water. What shall it avail to simulate life? It must flow from Him who is the life. What shall it avail with the

most honest zeal to stir up the flesh? It is the Spirit that quickeneth. The title here assumed by the Lord furnishes the key both to the sin and to the deliverance,—He that hath the seven spirits of God and the seven stars—He who hath given the Holy Ghost in distribution to the Church, and from whom flow all the ministries of His house. How did the Church receive? By the gift of the Holy Ghost. How did she hear? By men sent of Christ. She received from Christ by men of His appointment, and in ways defined by Him. By her forgetting this, her so-called Reformation has decayed. By remembering this, the good which remains to her shall be really strengthened. Faith in baptism, as our life—in the Eucharist, as our food—in the gift of the Holy Ghost, as establishing all grace, investing with all power, enriching with all gifts, and sealing our future hope; faith in Christ's presence and power with those whom He calls and ordains; faith in the preacher, by whom we hear—in the pastor, by whom we are tended—in the Apostle, as the lawgiver and endower—in the prophet, as the enlightener and quickener. Such faith will restore the Church, conserve and strengthen what shall remain, and lead her on to perfection. But as long as the life of the Church is regarded as independent of the fulness of the Spirit, the reality of mission, and the right orders of ministry—as a divine institution, not as a human invention,—so long must death and dissolution threaten her. And if she does not watch, despising the Lord's solemn command to one and all—"Watch" (Mark xiii. 37)—He "will come upon her as a thief, and she shall not know what hour He will come upon her." As the thief (whose work, unlike that of other men, is in the night) cometh unseen to steal our goods, so, while she is thinking herself all that she should be and prepared for every issue—while she is speaking peace to herself in the contemplation of her efforts and apparent fruitfulness—while she is building a house diverse from the pattern, and not on the foundations, of God—while she has the elements of a commonwealth, but not those of a kingdom,—He will come upon her, in an attitude totally unprepared, with sudden requirements which she cannot meet, with a test which she cannot stand, with a work which she cannot comprehend, with a way of receiving and hearing in which she has neither faith, experience, nor joy, to take away from them that have not that which they seem to have, and make manifest, as the necessary result of despising His ways, the barrenness and emptiness of all, nay, the wickedness of much, in which they have boasted.

The promises in the epistles to Ephesus, Smyrna, and Pergamos are addressed to the whole Church; but, as those to Thyatira are confined to the *οἱ λοιποὶ*, the remnant, so these to Sardis are confined to the *ὀλίγα ὀνόματα*, to the few names which have not defiled their garments. The name is that which distinguishes one person from another, and expresses the qualities for which he is known. The words *το ὄνομα ὅτι ζῆς* point to reputation among men as the snare of this Church, and to individualization, which breaks up communion, as the occasion of this snare; the words *ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων* (xi. 13) convey the same idea of individual fame—right when the man is signalized by God, wrong when he is signalized by men; and the text informs us that in a day when many have had their faith eaten out by the honour which cometh from men, and when the name of the Lord has been obliterated by the names of men, there shall nevertheless be some of those so honoured who, notwithstanding, seek that honour which cometh of God, and so preserve their garments undefiled. Their garments are that measure in which they have put on Christ—the measure of grace which they have received, and in which they are called to walk,—whether it be the grace of baptism, common to all, or any special grace, such as that of appointment to the ministry. Those defile their garments, and provoke God to strip their garments off, who do the works of the flesh. The works of the flesh, moreover, are not merely what men call fleshly sins; they include all that frustrates the grace of God. And we know how Sardis did so, by forgetting how she had received and heard—in other words, by setting herself to work with instruments which are not His ordinances, with schemes which are not His counsels, and novel helps which supplanted the gift of the Holy Ghost. Yet some in Sardis have escaped this almost universal sin, and kept their faith in divine gifts and ordinances. To them the promise comes. And, as with Thyatira, so here, the promise is twofold: first for this world, then for the future. In the first place, they shall, in this world, walk with Christ in white (garments), for they are worthy. In other words, as the remnant in Thyatira who had protested against Jezebel should have no other burden laid upon them, so the remnant in Sardis who had resisted the temptation to self-originated and man-commended works should be honoured as instruments to do the works of Christ. When He should appear again, walking by His Spirit in the midst of the Churches, in the primitive

fulness of His grace and endowment, in His restored gifts and ministries, they should walk with Him, they should be used as restorers, because they would not accept the schemes of man. And this honour should be the earnest of their future glory, when Christ shall no longer walk about, when the preparation of the Church shall be over, and her perfection shall be come. By men they shall be disowned. They shall not be among the popular and admired. Yea, they shall be blotted out of men's books—cast out of the synagogue—neither canonized and named in diptychs by one part of the Church, nor flattered and petted by another, but excommunicated and sent into disgrace by all—peradventure, also, blotted out of this life's book by martyrdom! Yet they shall sit with Christ, clothed as the perfect. Their names shall stand uneffaced in the Book of Life. They shall be confessed by Him whom they have confessed, before those in whose presence they have confessed Him.

PHILADELPHIA.

It is most observable that the description which Christ gives of the Church in Philadelphia commences, not with what she has done for Him, but with what He has done for her; to indicate that, as her life began in Him, her revival also proceeds from Him, after her own ways have brought her down to the lowest, and made her utterly bare. Yet, though the initiative lies with Him, it is not without a moral reason. His selection of her is not arbitrary. It rests on a "because." She has "a little strength, and has preserved His word, and has not denied His name." Her strength is in the power of Christ's resurrection. She has a little strength because, instead of gazing always on Christ crucified, she still remembers Jesus Christ of the seed of David raised from the dead, and expects Him to work. His word is the divine programme of His work—the assurance of perfection, the promise of His second coming in glory. This she has kept as a jewel—one, to her, of value untold, though despised by men. His name is the exponent of His character and office; and the letters of His name correspond to the various ministries through which that one office is exercised, whether in the Church, in the State, or in the Family. In the Church, the names of men have been praised, sought unto, and trusted in; and the name of

Christ, in His ordinances, has been passed by. Rule in the State and the Family has lost all its prestige of divinity. There is no letter of Christ's glorious name, as the Sustainer of all things and the Fountain of all authority, order, instruction, and blessing, which the unbelief of man has not well-nigh expunged, which his blasphemy has not denied. This Name she does not deny. She clings to its almost illegible traces with melancholy affection, and lives in the hope of its recovery and full republication. *Therefore* has the Lord set before *her*, as He has not done before others, an open door. He has rewarded her in a way corresponding to that in which she has pleased Him. He does not *now* open the door; He sets before her one long since opened—that door by which Christ entered into Heaven itself, when God showed Him the way of life—that door which forms our boldness of access into the Holiest—that ascent to God and descent from God, through the opened Heaven and the Son of Man, of which Jacob's ladder was the type. (John i. 51.) Whatever the communion of individuals with God may have been, that of the Church with God has been well-nigh arrested. But He undoes what we have done. He restores to us our lost access, privilege, communion, gift, endowment, and ministry. He brings in no new gospel, but He revives the old; and He does more, He fully develops it. He publishes it, not merely as the Gospel of grace for the penitent, but as the Gospel of the kingdom for the holy; full measure and running over; a double portion, as the manna on the sixth day. And no man can shut the door. Our unbelief once closed it; and if it were man who had forced it open again, it might be yet closed upon us. But when the Lord puts to His hand the second time, He shall finish His work. We may miss or turn away from the door, but the door shall never be shut.

This serves to illustrate the titles here assumed by the Lord. He that is holy—He who is dedicated to God by resurrection and ascension, and who will dedicate us to God in Himself. He who is true—He whose estate at God's right hand is the full declaration of the invisible God, and who will make us the righteousness of God in Himself, fulfilling all God's purpose, and performing all His promise in us—His body and fulness. He who hath the key of David, who openeth and no man shutteth, who shutteth and no man openeth—He whose grace cometh unto us, though man resist and forbid it, and whose judgment descendeth, though man speak peace and dream of continued grace,—His are

the attributes in which Philadelphia yet believes, and which to her shall yet be exhibited. They are unchangeably His, and stand ready to be evoked in all their pristine fulness. He cannot deny Himself. He, the faithful among the faithless, shall come forth to meet her revived faith and hope. And by this we may estimate the amount of her likeness to Him, that His first reward to her is in using her as the instrument of His mercy, before He exempts her from the fate of the impenitent. That brotherly love which her name indicates, is neither a fanciful attachment, nor mere satisfaction with those who are like ourselves. It is the love of brethren, *because* they are brethren. All who are baptized into Christ are made brethren by an act of God. The equal love of all the baptized, because they are members of Christ, is the love here pointed out. But where has that been seen? Has not the attitude of the baptized towards each other for many centuries been one of hatred? Does not the prosperity of one depend on the misfortune of the other? If "he that hateth his brother is a murderer," are not churches which hate one another murderers too? And if no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him, how can churches that hate each other retain the life of God? From the Apostolic age downwards, no Christian body has been seen which recognizes all the baptized as brethren, and seeks their common good. Philadelphia is the first to do so; therefore is she rewarded by being used to do good to them all. Out of the synagogue of Satan, those who profess to be, but are not, Jews, shall God cause many to come and to do homage at her feet, and confess that He hath loved her. The synagogue of Satan is the Christian Church, in so far as she is standing in other counsels, doing other works, and entertaining other hopes, than those of Christ. Although she is the Church, her conduct belies her character. She is not the Jew inwardly. She is not praised of God, because she is not fully following Christ. But of these false Jews shall many be given to the intercession, and be gained by the holy worship and blameless walk of Philadelphia. When she shall be rewarded with prosperity for her prayers on behalf of the great sections of the Church, as Job was when he prayed for his friends, then shall they who were once unfaithful come to bow at her feet—not in idolatry of her, but honouring God, who is in her of a truth. And they shall confess, not (to her praise) that she has surpassed them in love to God, but (to God's praise) that He has loved her—that her pre-eminence is the fruit of unmerited grace, intended for

all alike, to which she has yielded, while they resisted it. By what tribulations and in what perplexities they may be taught this lesson we know not. Our business is to hold fast the promise, and expect yet to see a great company of the priests who shall obey the faith, and of the people who shall flock as doves to the windows. The bringing forth of the key of David, which of old signified the fall of Shebna, and the transference of the glory to Eliakim, points to a like act of judgment now on the existing priesthood. But it also assures us that the priesthood which God shall bring forth shall be as a sure nail on which all the glory shall be securely hung, and that all who call upon His name shall be delivered. The key of David is Apostolic rule.

The Church in Philadelphia exhibits yet another grace, which also obtains a definite reward in this dispensation. She "keeps the word of Christ's patience." Although this is our duty at all times, we are especially called to it after the opened door has been set before us; for then hope combines with suffering to engender impatience. If the whole creation feels its travail, the Church, as the first-fruits of the creatures, feels it most. Many of God's children who are ignorant as to His way of deliverance feel the burden almost as much as they who know it, and in proportion to their ignorance is their danger. The temptation of all is to effect or accept a deliverance which is not from God. They who seek bread are about to have a stone palmed upon them; they who ask a fish, a serpent; they who ask an egg, a scorpion. None but they who have the true hope, and are chastened by it, can with patience wait for that which they see not. They only are content to abide the time of God, as Christ their great Exemplar did when He waited patiently for the Lord till He brought him up out of the horrible pit, and put a new song in His mouth (Psalm xl. 1); and they only know how, instead of *their* waiting for Christ, *He* is made to wait for them. They only believe that His long-suffering is our salvation, because He is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. And what shall be their reward? That they shall be saved from the snare laid by Satan for the impatient. Because they have *preserved* the word of Christ's patience, He shall *preserve* them out of, or exempt them from, that hour of trial which is about to come upon the whole habitable world (*οἰκουμένης*), to try them which dwell upon the earth (*γῆς*). Christ is the heir of the world. We wait to inherit it with Him. The great temptation will be the appearance

of a man who is not the Son of God, but who claims to be the heir, and promises us the inheritance, as it is written—"If another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive" (John v. 43). The great tribulation—the tribulation *κατ' ἐξοχην* (Rev. vii. 14), the worst and final burden of this world—shall be the universal and absolute dominion of this false claimant—his specious pretensions as the fulfiller of God's counsels, his fair promises as the champion of suffering humanity, and his signs and wonders as the mighty power of God. From this temptation we petition daily for exemption in the Lord's Prayer. Then, as in the 44th Psalm, the faithful shall be able to say, "We have not stretched out our hand to a strange God." While the multitude (Rev. vii.) pass through the great tribulation, the sealed are exempt from it. All who dwell on the earth (*i.e.*, all who see nothing more in the place and prospects of the Church than the possession or hope of a suitable position as the best of earthly institutions) shall be sorely bestead under the great temptation to stretch out their hands to the false deliverer—to the strange God. But they who dwell in Heaven (Rev. xiii. 6), who "are seated in heavenly places in Christ" (Eph. ii. 6), and whose "conversation is in Heaven, from whence they look for the Saviour" (Phil. iii. 20)—they who are of the New Jerusalem, which shall descend out of Heaven from God—they who constitute the sealed company, numbered in all the tribes, and distinguished, as the first-fruits, from the harvest (Rev. xxi. 2),—these shall be exempt from it. It shall not touch them. To them alone shall be fulfilled the petition in the Lord's Prayer—"Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." They especially, as the called and chosen, shall be found faithful; they, as the elect of God, shall be found incapable of deception by that which deceives others; they shall reject the whole lie, because they have the whole truth; and he shall not lay hand on them, whose hand they have ever refused. They shall be already in the cloud of glory with the true Heir, when the unsealed, like Dan, shall die for the commandment of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ. As the description of Philadelphia indicates restored Apostleship, so the promise given to her implies the sealing of the saints again, by that ordinance, with the Earnest of the kingdom.

And this is no distant hope. Every act of judgment, every dispensation of recompense, is, in one sense, the coming of the Lord—a foretaste of His personal coming. To almost all of the Churches the Lord speaks of His coming—to some

of His coming quickly—to one of His coming as a thief; but here alone is His coming associated with the bestowal of the crown—not the crown of royalty, but the crown of victory (στέφανον). This Church alone is described as contending for the crown. It is a last struggle for life and death. Many run, but one obtaineth the prize. She represents that one. The crown waits to be placed upon the victor's brows. But on that account the danger of its loss is the greater. And how is she to secure it? Not by any new endowment or new Gospel, but by holding fast that which she hath—faith in Christ's resurrection, ascension, and second advent—faith in the gift of the Holy Ghost, in the grace of holiness, in the purpose, way, and promise of God—and steadfast cleaving unto His ordinances in the communion of saints. This is what she must furnish. He will do the rest. That access which the cherubim at the gate of Eden typified, shall be fulfilled through ministries bearing Christ's authority, ordained in His way, and instinct with His quickening presence. How speedily and marvellously this shall be done we know not. The Lord says to His enemies, "In your days, O rebellious house, will I say the word, and will perform it." And does He not inform His friends? There is a generation which shall not pass till all be fulfilled—which shall not only *believe* the promise made to them that are alive and remain, but shall *receive* it. It has not been recorded in vain that at the first coming of Christ, the Lord revealed to Simeon, that just and devout expectant of Israel's consolation, that he should not see death till he had seen the Lord's Christ; nor that the three Apostles did live to see Christ coming in the transfiguration; nor that John did tarry till Christ figuratively came at the destruction of Jerusalem. There is no fanaticism in looking for similar revelation, in a catholic form, to those churches which, like individuals of old, are now alike devout and expectant. And if all God's promises, especially the greatest, are to be wrestled for, and may be gained by faith and missed by wavering, we should earnestly desire and assuredly grasp every aid to faith which God may graciously vouchsafe, and, undaunted by the successive fall of the faithful under the stroke of the last enemy, ever hold fast for ourselves as one body the hope of translation, whether by the speeding of God's work or by the lengthening of our days.

The promise for the future has two parts. First: "I will make him a pillar or monument (στυλον) in the temple of my God, and he shall go no more out." As Jachin and Boaz

stood before the temple—the one the symbol of commencement, the other of completion—to show that He who had begun would finish, and would finish as He began, so shall the victor of Philadelphia be a monument to Christ, the Alpha and the Omega, the author and finisher of our faith, in the power of the Holy Ghost, in the temple of Christ's God, not in that of Antichrist, who is his own God. Such shall never go out—apostasy no longer possible. Next: "I will write upon him the name of my God, and the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which descendeth out of Heaven from my God, and my name, the new." Observe—three names all written by Christ; One, yet written in three forms, in answer to three conditions. 1. The name of Christ's God; for the head of Christ is God, as the head of man is Christ. This is the reward of them who will not learn from Antichrist to be Christ and God to themselves. 2. The name of God's city—not a field or unwalled village—not built by man, out of the earth or for the world, but built, endowed, and fortified by God—built from Heaven—from Him, out of whom the whole body groweth—and built for the future kingdom. This is the reward of those who believe in the communion of saints, who will not hold the Head apart from the Body, who are saved *in* the Church (out of which is no salvation) as well as *by* the Lord, and who see in it not an earthly system, but a heavenly mystery. The Church has a name, as well as God and Christ. None can reign with Christ who have not her name as well as His. Yet her name, though distinct, is not separate. She is neither a God nor a Christ in herself. Her name is Immanuel—God with us! 3. Finally, the new name of Christ—not merely as Eternal Son, not as the crucified One, but as the Son of Man declared to be the Son of God. A new name, but not a new Christ. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever; but His new name is the seal of our adoption, the pledge of our eternal honour and stability.

LAODICEA.

The one, but damning sin of Laodicea, the only Church which is blamed without any mixture of praise, is lukewarmness—being neither cold nor hot. Why is this sin in her so great? Because of the circumstances in which it is committed. Have we not read of the curse on those who came

not to the help of the Lord against the mighty? (Judges v. 23.) Have we not heard the cry, "Who is on the Lord's side?" (Exod. xxxii. 26.) Have we not read how Phinehas stayed the plague? (Num. xxv.) In time of peace, remissness in duty—nay, even desertion—does not call down upon the soldier the punishment of death. Till men are put to the proof, the measure of their slumbering fidelity or lurking treachery is not brought out. But when there is treason in the city, rebellion in the camp, war at the gates, all men are bound to speak out. Each must choose his side. The neutral are justly punished as the most dangerous enemies of the king. And that which might else be venial, becomes unpardonable crime. In like manner, when the question is, whether God or Baal be God?—whether God has become man, or man is to become God?—when the contest is for the throne of the universe, and the contending claimants are Christ and Antichrist, the Lion of the tribe of Judah and the Unicorn of universal usurpation,—then there is no neutral ground, and no room for neutral policy. He that is not for Christ is against Him. We cannot at once worship Christ in the Church, and toy with Antichrist in the world. He that cannot discern between the two is smitten with judicial blindness; and he that does not care which succeeds is a traitor at heart. Such is the Church of Laodicea—a Christian constitution, the senses of which are, by reason of disuse, no longer exercised to discern between good and evil (Heb. v. 14); on which Satan, having palmed both the serious works and the silly tricks of Antichrist, is ready to palm Antichrist himself; and which has a heart so divided between God and Mammon, that it is ready to sell itself to the highest bidder, as promises may invite or threatenings may drive. To her He saith, "I am about to spue thee out of my mouth;" that is, to confess her by word and deed to be His no longer. He that confesseth Christ, him will Christ confess, by saving him, as His, from all the delusion and power of the enemy; but he who takes up Christ's name into his mouth, yet holds it there, ready to spue it out and reject it for any adequate inducement, him also does Christ hold in His mouth, ready to reject him, when he is tried and found unloyal, when the cord of divine patience gives way. In other words, they who are dreaming on as idle spectators, speculating as prophetic, philosophical, or political diletanti, or wavering as disguised traitors, while the hosts of Heaven and hell are mustering, are on the brink of perdition.

This is the day of which Zechariah (xiv. 6) speaks—a

day known to the Lord—not day nor night—when the light is neither clear nor dark—when the natural insight of man is found inadequate either to guide or to guard us—when no light but that which God gives at the eventide of this dispensation shall enable us to separate between the works of light and those of darkness, and when all who do not stand in that shall be misled by the giant but bastard progeny of the sons of God and the daughters of men—of Christian truth and heathen error. This is the day of faith, in which faith alone can discern and march unwaveringly onwards. Without faith, the only escape of men from the torment of uncertainty is into the intoxicating witchery of spiritual delusion.

Yet even for this Church the Lord has a lingering love and an admonition of mercy. In still calling her His Church, He still abides true to His covenant, though the final decision is imminent. And He founds His admonition to the angel on a description of the angel's state: "Thou sayest, I am rich, and have made my fortune, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art the wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked one." This is the case not merely of one who has shut his eyes to his true condition, but of one who has totally misconceived it, mistaking utter poverty for abundant wealth, misery for happiness, blindness for clear sight, and nakedness for rich apparel. He is *κατ' ἐξοχην*—the wretched, poor, miserable, blind, and naked one. None were ever so much so, none can be more so. How, then, can he conceive himself the reverse? It is like the dream of the maniac, who counts his paper cap a crown, his pebbles a treasure, and his cell a palace. The difference turns upon the *source* of what he has. If it is of God, he is rich; if it is of himself, of the world, or of Satan, he is poor. He is rich who is rich towards God—i.e., whose whole treasure is Christ. He has made his fortune who has won Christ; he has need of nothing who has all that he asketh of God; he sees, who is in God's light, the eyes of whose understanding God opens; he is clothed who has put on the Lord Jesus. But he whose treasure is not in Heaven, who is not resting in God, who has not confidence in prayer, who wanders away from God's light, and has scales upon his eyes, and who does not abide in Christ, is wretched, miserable, poor, blind, and naked, whatever else he may possess or be. And the more substitute possessions he has the worse his case. Now, what do we see in our day? There never was a time when

faith in the risen Lord, rest and joy in Him, confidence and diligence in prayer, light as to divine purposes, clothing by the full possession and faithful use of sacraments, and ordinances, and gifts, were so departed from the mass of professing Christians as at present; yet there never was a time when they boasted more of the privileges, powers, institutions, and attainments of man. The whole tendency of the age is to persuade man that he is sufficient to himself, and to set him, like a maniac, as a god and king in the very midst of his misery. And it has too much become the traitorous work of the Church to confirm the maniac in his dream, to invest this delusion with a religious garb. The Church not only encourages the pride of man by flattering him up into a deity who has right to the earth, but keeps pace with the delusions of the world in boasting of the grace which she has received of God as a treasure of her own, laying it as a foundation for the temple of pride, and thus preparing herself to be the prophet of the beast. Indeed, while God is stretching out His hand and lifting up His voice to help the Church out of her misery, the great plea of those who will not see the one or hear the other is, that we have all which we can possibly desire already. While the Lord arises to be the Lawgiver and Judge of His people, giving judges as at the first, and counsellors as at the beginning, they insist for their right to legislate for and judge themselves, severing the bond which ties them to the throne of Christ. While He is preparing to judge the world in righteousness, they consent to the erection of the popular will as the tribunal before which all shall be brought. And as mankind, after first being worshippers of that which was above them, and then worshippers of nothing, are in every sphere of life and occupation learning to be worshippers of themselves, so has the Church, after being a true worshipper of God, gradually ceased to worship, and then begun to contemplate her own beauty and wealth, instead of Christ's, and, by saying "I am rich, and increased in goods, and have need of nothing," to reject the kingdom reserved for the poor in spirit, who are rich towards, and draw from, God. The Virgin, idolized by man, shall learn to worship herself, instead of Christ. Boasting of her own immaculate conception, she shall fail to bring forth Immanuel, and shall, under colour of defending her own blamelessness against the accusations of man, harden her heart against the healing chastisement of God. Laodicea, "*popular judgment*," or judgment proceeding from man, is, in the Church, the very

counterpart and religion of Antichrist. Although all Christians stand in the same federal relation to God, and have the same promises, their fate shall not be the same. The day of judgment for the House of God commences when Christ gives His judges, His Apostles, again, to prepare His people for judging with Him. And that day, revealing the thoughts of many hearts, shall separate between those who will be perfect and those who will be as they are, between those who will be judged of Him and those who use the power and judgment of man to refuse, counterfeit, or rival His judgment. Dan shall judge his people *as* one of the tribes of Israel; but Dan shall not be sealed. Another tribe, distinguished for fruitfulness, shall spread into his vacant place. That which happened among the Apostles shall, in some degree, find its counterpart among the tribes. The Dan of the spiritual tribes is like the Laodicea of the Churches. The power and judgment of man are the watchword and the ruin of both. Yet as Dan, though unsealed, bites the horse's heels, and overthrows his rider, and as Elisha, although not caught up, follows up the work of Elijah, so may many who repent in Laodicea, although they do not escape the wrath of Antichrist, be used, as the remnant of the woman's seed, to convict him by the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ.

The blindest and nakedest of all beggars, dreaming himself a king in wisdom and power, glory and wealth, shall suddenly find himself the slave of Satan. Yet there is counsel for him if he will obtain it: "Buy of me gold tried in the fire, and white raiment, and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve." In other words, Cast away the knowledge which thou hast gathered, and seek to Christ for that knowledge of God which alone deserves the name of truth. Clothe thyself against the blast, and beautify thyself, by standing in the grace of God, and using all His ordinances. These things must be bought of Christ. The price to be paid for them is all that thou hast and art in thyself. And exercise thy senses by use in God's service, that, by the unction which resteth on the diligent and faithful, thou mayest know Antichrist when thou seest him, and hate him when thou knowest him; not by studying the features of the Devil, but by gazing ever on those of Christ, and turning abhorrent from all others. The tribulation of this Church shall be great; but it is that active treatment by which the good Physician desires, at any price, to save the sick. Her life hangs on her becoming zealous; and, in longing for her

life, He grudges not to smite. This smiting is the only voice which she shall hear from Him. Words have failed to rouse her. Deeds, if anything shall, must do it. She shall be cast into a worse prison than that of the faithful in Smyrna. She shall languish under the rod of Antichrist. The time of the Lord shall then have come. He shall have taken His first-fruits unto Himself; He shall stand at the door of the world and knock; He shall still be rejected by the world; but He shall prefer His claim to His inheritance, and will establish His claim. He knocks by His works of judgment. Late though it be, all that are not utterly deaf, all that will hear that knocking, which shall shake to ruin the edifice of the things that are, shall yet be admitted to His favour. And while the sealed company, gathered and numbered, during the holding of the winds, out of every tribe of the spiritual Israel, are kept in the secret of Christ's pavilion till they shall stand manifest with Him on Mount Zion, the harvest, of which the consecrated first-fruits are the Saviour's, shall yet be seen in a multitude, not numbered as they, but found in all nations, who shall not love their lives unto the death, and shall come forth, with robes washed in blood, out of *the* great tribulation, out of the great purgatory of the imperfect. (Rev. vii.)

How wonderfully adapted are the titles of the Lord to the condition of Laodicea! The Amen, the faithful and true Witness, the Beginning of the Creation of God, He in whom the whole counsel of God shall be fulfilled (in Him, and not in another who cometh in his own name), all of it—not a jot or a tittle suffered to fall. The faithful Witness to Him whose commission He bears—faithful, because He is one with Him who sent Him—the declarer of the Father, the true God, and eternal life. The beginning of the creation of God; not he who would usurp all, being himself a thing made, but He by whom all things were made; the perfect One, as created of God by resurrection from the dead, not as representing the proud perfection of fallen and mortal man!

And what does He promise? A throne, but not a throne of usurpation—a share of His throne who has right to reign, who has earned His throne by obedience, and who is now exalted to the throne of the Father, ere He shall ascend His own, that when He shall do so, He may be seen subject under Him who hath subjected all to Him, that God may be all in all! The throne of Christ, resting on the throne of the Eternal Father, is the only throne that shall stand, and Christ, not Antichrist, shall be its occupant.

How shall we rightly improve all this? By hearing the warnings, taking the counsels, and embracing the promises here given. The light maketh *all* things manifest; the rain causeth *every plant* to grow. In us, all, even the most opposite features of character, now tend to prominent and concentrated manifestation. Only by implicitly following Christ's counsel can we exhibit the good and check the evil. In perfecting our labours, let us tremble lest our love decay. In acting wisely, let us beware of shrinking from the cross. In seeking acceptance of man, let our souls reject every rank which this world can assign to us. At once encouraged and warned by that great religious polity which has well been called the masterpiece of God, of man, and of the Devil, let us labour to bring forth the whole machinery of grace, and see that we use it with a single eye. Let personal holiness keep pace with our estimate and exercise of every divine authority, ordinance, and gift; let us not through joy outrun the Lord, through confidence become secure, or through prosperity proud; and let our whole life be continually made an oblation to God, lest, admiring ourselves, we become indifferent whether God or Satan enrich us.

WARNING FOR THE UNWARY
AGAINST
SPIRITUAL EVIL.

1854.

WARNING FOR THE UNWARY

AGAINST

SPIRITUAL EVIL.

MOSES, the lawgiver of Israel, typified the risen Christ—the Son set over His own house. His words were addressed to those whom the law, as a schoolmaster, should bring to Christ. The entrance into the land of promise, although undoubtedly a type of our entrance into the future kingdom, was at the same time a type of the commencement of the Christian economy, as the mystery of that kingdom in those cases in which residence in the land of promise was spoken of as a state of probation. Hence the sins which Moses warned Israel not to commit in the land represented sins to be avoided by the Christian Church. He warned those who had God for their guide against acting like those who had not, by seeking light and help elsewhere than of God. He grounded his warning on their obligation to wait for the Prophet like unto him; and, in doing so, he has warned us on the ground that we have that Prophet among us already.

The promise of this Prophet was applied by Peter, in pleading with the Jews, to Christ; not in the strictly prophetic part of His office, as distinct from other parts, but in His character as the Declarer of God's will by all His offices. And Moses, while he specially described that character as furnishing us with such guidance and help that we shall be left without pretext in seeking these elsewhere, also described the Person who should bear it by two tokens: first, that He should be no angelic messenger, but partaker of one nature with those whom He guided; second, that He should know the will which He declared, not by vision or dream, but by face-to-face intercourse with God.

What desiderata, then, does this office supply?

As all known religions claim divine origin, so have all claimed to be maintained by permanent communication from

a Divine Being. In one form or other, a Jacob's ladder exhibits a theme common to all nations and ages,—the satisfaction of a universal desire to be supernaturally guided, and to be saved by true guidance from false. The Old and New Testament economies are distinguished from heathen religions, not by being the only systems which professed sensible intercourse between Heaven and earth, but by being those in which the Being with whom men had intercourse was the true and living God. As the true God continued to commune with Adam after his creation—communed with his offspring after the promise of the Seed, communed with Noah after the flood, communed with the elect seed after the call of Abraham, and communed with Israel, not only from between the cherubim, but by Urim and Thummim, and by the prophets, after the giving of the law,—so has every heathen nation had its sacred traditions, oracles, and signs, as the complements and seals of its professedly Heaven-born religion. In like manner, the Lord Jesus did not cease to commune with His disciples when He rose from the dead. Neither has He ceased to commune with the Church since the day of Pentecost, or the closing of the Scripture Canon. On the contrary, the descent of the Holy Ghost, by whom the Father and the Son abide with men, to occupy the Church as His temple, established such a permanent intercourse of God with man as could not before exist. The Canon itself is a fruit of this, and, although closed, is a standing pledge that Christ, who is with us to the end of the world, will not cease to commune with us by His appointed—though in themselves fallible—ordinances, not merely by hidden operation on the heart of each believer, but in ways common to the Church as one body; and that He will afford us, in all things, guidance at once adequate and exclusive.

Yet it has been reserved for this dispensation, in which the intercourse of God with man ought to be the most constant and perceptible, to become that in which it is the most rare and uncertain. The faithful have, indeed, that precious communion with God in secret, without which all other intercourse were vain; but it differs little from that which the faithful in all ages before Christ had. Whereas the Christian Church is called to have and exhibit an intercourse with God peculiar to, and ennobled by, her place as the Spouse of Christ—not the mere hidden comfort, but the manifestation of the Spirit. And the Urim and Thummim, instead of disappearing before Gospel light, should appear in that light, transfigured into that which they shadowed forth. Hardly,

however, had the first Apostles died, and the Apostolic age run out, when the Christian polity, even where most faithful to the laws of Christ, lost the especial tokens that the Law-giver Himself was present with her, and assumed the features of an earthly polity. Man had, indeed, been visited of God; but the visit was over. The heavenly Visitant had left them to themselves again. He had said that it was expedient for them that He should go. But desertion, not presence in a better form, had been the apparent fruit of His ascension. Immanuel was no longer seen.

Although the sin of the Church had forfeited her full and proper measure of blessing, it has not prevented God from coming forth, in His wonderful mercy, at all times, to answer the faith of individuals, or succour the distressed by sure tokens of His presence. I do not here speak of the grace which rested on the Bishops of Christendom after the departure of Apostles—of that which still rests on every man who would faithfully serve God in the ministry—of the preservation of truth and life, discipline and holy worship, to the present day; but I speak of the more palpable evidences that the God whom we worship is the living God. Bating all that craft may have invented, or credulity believed, who can, unless pledged to a foregone conclusion, read Church history, or survey present Christendom, without being satisfied that God has ever vouchsafed to His people supernatural tokens of His presence? And who among us, who has any heart for the sufferings and contendings of our native land, or any reverence for its worthies, can resist the conviction that our martyrs of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were the subjects of Divine help and comfort in manifold sensible forms,—in prophecy, visions, and dreams, and other miraculous interpositions of God?

Nevertheless Zion, as a whole, hath seemed forsaken of her God. But while the desire after better things, and the faith that they should be seen, have not been quenched in the hearts of the faithful, that natural longing of all men for superior guidance and aid, which, when morbid and misdirected, is one of the most fertile sources of evil, but which, in its essence, is just, has been left unimpaired. Man was not made to be a light or helper to himself. Neither are all the provinces of his being capable of being addressed by mere iron law or dry reasoning. As the eye is made for light, and by light knows a world which touch can never reach, so has man that in him which demands supernatural guidance. When Saul, displeasing God, was answered by

Urim no longer, he used unhallowed means to recover the guidance of Samuel. Scripture and history both present us with cases of men who, having forfeited the light of God, sought light from the powers of darkness, as angels of light. Many past and present efforts of Christians to restore the blessing of primitive or mediæval times have sprung from the desire to fill an aching void, which God will assuredly fill in His own time and by His own work. And not a few of the spiritual novelties which have recently occupied the attention of society, and have revealed at once the childish curiosity, the foolhardy profanity, and the theological ignorance of those who have been taken by them, have owed their popularity to the fact that they profess to supply that which man justly craves. There is, indeed, a proud lust in man to compass what he should not grasp, and penetrate where he should not enter. This lust God will never gratify, though Satan will. Yet there is a just desire in man to know all beyond the range of his natural powers, which God would make known to him. To know this is man's true preservation against delusion; to be ignorant of it is a condition in which man not only comes short of his privilege, but lacks his due defence; and while he is thus defenceless, the more his just desires survive, the greater is his risk of deception.

Israel had to contend against spiritual powers of evil without the armour which Christianity supplies. Our guilt, if deluded, is much greater than theirs. Yet even they were required to detect and reject the evil. Without here entering on the detailed consideration of the special forms of evil enumerated in Deut. xviii. 9—22, suffice it to remark that the heathen whom Israel cast out hearkened to two great classes of deceivers—witches and false prophets; the one professing to attain certain ends, the other professing to reveal certain mysteries. Both classes had a source diverse from God's power, wisdom, and mercy, and moved in spheres extrinsic to His covenant.

History, both sacred and profane, informs us by what a strange paradox contempt and slavish dread were mingled in the feelings of the most civilized heathens towards their deities. And the same thing is seen in regard to the modes of spiritual guidance prevalent among them. The true God will be had in reverence of all who seek to Him; but Satan is content to be derided of men, if he can only succeed in fascinating them. When Christ appeared, scepticism as to the existence of a Divine Being and the practice of black arts were both at their height. Christianity corrected both

of these apparently opposite evils. Faith in God was not only restored, but elevated to its highest form; and the oracles were silenced. Yet both the tendency of fallen man to seek illegitimate light and many of his old practices survived. In every age and quarter of the Church heathen superstitions have lurked, sometimes unchanged, sometimes disguised, nay, advanced to honour under a Christian garb. And now, when God is about to bring into the world again His First-begotten, we find combined, as of old, unbelief, atheistic or pantheistic, in a personal God, and the lust, whether openly avowed or disguised under physical research, for spiritual operation. The two phenomena have one parentage. Man must have a God, and seek unto Him. As faith in the true God wanes, faith in false gods waxes. Hatred of God makes men sceptics,—need of a God makes them followers of spirits. Our Lord has said, “When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith in the earth?” And men’s unbelief is seen not only in their failure to wait for the Son of God from Heaven, but also in their madness to seek help and guidance elsewhere than in Him.

The operations of Christ always carry with them a confession of their true character and source; those of Satan are always disguised. He shows his work, but he hides himself. Provided he can induce men to receive his works, nay, in order to do so, he is willing that none of them shall be referred to him, that he himself shall be mistaken for a blundering physical agent, and that his very existence shall be denied as an exploded folly. The obsolete Devil is the worst of all deceivers. In consenting to be scouted as a myth, or eliminated by physical experiment and induction, he takes the wise in their own craftiness. He has for all kinds of fish all kinds of bait, which he is too skilful to misadapt. His wares are the tallies of the lusts to which they minister; his works are facts. The men who stake all on experiment and induction are at his mercy. He rules in unsanctified intellect. The men who trust in logic are his tools. If man, in his vanity and pride, will set himself as God, admire his own attainments, and usurp all creation—in politics, in science, in arts, in commerce—yea, even in theology—Satan will help man in all these provinces. And if man will find no more than a new power of nature in every new phenomenon, he closes himself against God, who will never consent to be treated as a physical power; he leaves the whole field open to Satan, who will. And he precludes all possibility of detecting anything properly Satanic.

Augustine has already warned us against "enchantments, pestiferous consociations of men and devils," which adopt the gentler name of "physical powers."

Satan often accompanies his deeper delusions, ecclesiastical or political, with others of a more popular and ephemeral character, by which, as a sort of by-play to his principal game, he entertains the simple, diverts their attention, and renders them familiar with his presence. There can be no sadder proof how totally unexercised the senses of Christian men now are to discern good and evil than the ease with which so many persons, otherwise devout, are inveigled into defiling contact with such things, and the conversion of so many ministers of Christ, who should be the watchmen of Zion, into the priests of such delusions.

The things at present in vogue are of two classes—those in which unlawful power is exercised by man, and those in which unlawful knowledge is imparted to him.

There is no power but of God. No exercise of power is legitimate save one in harmony with His appointments. A power which enables man to transcend the proper limits of his being is certainly unlawful. God has endowed man with reason, by which both to apprehend and to comprehend not only all natural, but (through Divine illumination of the new man) all spiritual things; but He has not endowed man with omniscience, or with power to know the hearts of others, save by their acts or words. God may, indeed, reveal what He pleases to man concerning the hidden things of nature or grace, or concerning the condition of men's hearts; or He may use the mouths of men to utter His knowledge of these things—nay, He may select individuals whom He may habitually use for such ends,—but no man received at his creation or birth such knowledge as a thing proper to his being. And God has not put it in the power of any individual to do any spontaneous act by which he shall either generate such knowledge in himself, or extort it from God. Therefore knowledge thus obtained must either be unreal, or, if real, a ray of that unhallowed light which the prince of this world and his angels have concerning the purposes which they would frustrate, the creation which they have usurped, and the intelligences whom they have corrupted. It is the recompense of lawless desire and the fosterer of pride; and, while it elevates men into a spiritual region, it seduces them only the farther from God.

But any operation on man which impairs the integrity of his being is equally unlawful. Rule rightly exercised by

one man over another, is a divine ordinance—a witness for God, the only ruler. But God has given to us, in the character of His rule, a model for all legitimate human rule. He who made the dust of the earth out of nothing, and man out of that dust, never exercises His rule to the oppression or obliteration of man's spontaneous action and natural powers, or to the separation of one part of man's being from the rest. He never handles man as a mere machine; and while He would conform man to His will, He seeks that end, not by overbearing, but by elevating into spontaneous assent, the intelligence and volition of man. Hence any process by which one man obtains such a constant or temporary dominion over another, that the latter shall be the mere tool of the former, and, as such, the obsequious transcript of his thoughts, the involuntary servant of his will, or the passive channel of his action, is so far forth an abolition of that which God made man to be, and redeemed him to abide; and, therefore, it cannot be of God. It must be a trick of the enemy, pregnant with cruel irony, on man, by which to decoy his victims over the frontier of truth. Moreover, these things are not new; the heathen knew them well—the heathen world was their proper theatre,—but they are, or ought to be, novel to baptized men. In Christendom they should have no place. Their appearance is one mark of apostasy, a dread sign of God's displeasure, a note of imminent danger. Further, man may acquire unlawful knowledge as well as unlawful power; and this knowledge may be unlawful either in its nature or in its source, or in both. If the members of Christ are one with Him, as He is with the Father, and if He declares to us all things which He heareth of His Father, there is nothing of which we ought not to be sharers, save that consciousness of divinity which God alone can have. But there is an order in the communications as well as in the works of God; and however men may abuse all that He imparts, He will not impart what can minister merely to the lusts of men, or to the sordid interests of this world. He will not reveal that which man can learn by the exercise of his natural faculties; He will not sanction our resorting elsewhere for that which He denies to us, or our premature acquisition of that which He will give; and He will not vouchsafe to a favoured few, apart from the communion of His Church, that which shall place them on a vantage-ground of spiritual pre-eminence over others.

Now, be the intelligent oracles which men consult spi-

ritual beings or souls of the departed, the recourse had to them is contrary to all these principles. The holy angels are not only helpers, but messengers of God, to men. But they bring to us nothing save that which God would make known. They open no private path to wisdom, and grant no premature glimpses into the future, or curious peeps into the invisible; and they will not come at the summons of man. Whether the souls of the departed are ever used as God's messengers, we shall not here inquire. We know that, as by the Witch of Endor, their rest can be impertinently disturbed; but that is a thing most displeasing to God. And while from Justin Martyr downwards, the writers of the Church have recorded many instances of communications professing to come from the departed, several of the Fathers have left on record express warnings not to believe any devil who may come pretending to be the soul of this or that deceased person, even when the pretext of the visit is to stimulate devotion, to lead forward in holiness, to instruct in the deep things of God, or to seek our prayers and other spiritual good offices, and even if such visitants should flood us with the whole vocabulary of pious speech.

But this is not all. Were not the fact notorious, it were not to be credited that men could perpetrate the folly of seeking from inanimate things answers which intelligence alone can give, or the blasphemy of seeking from them things which God alone should teach us, or which God will not teach us at all. Brute matter may, indeed, be used of God, either as a sign of truth or as an instrument of blessing, but never as an intelligent informant, else it ceases to be brute matter. If it performs acts proper to intelligence, an intelligence must be behind it. That intelligence cannot be God, or any messenger of God. It must, therefore, be either the person who seeks, or a devil whom he finds. If the former, although he may have a confirmation of his own thoughts, he can learn nothing more. But the former it cannot be. The spirit of man acts, indeed, on his body; but it does so because his body is a portion of matter separated from all other matter by adoption into the personality of man. Herein lies the mystery of a person. The spirit of man cannot act directly on any matter extrinsic to himself (nay, not even on his own body after death). Its action on the material universe is always through man's own bodily organs, and cannot extend beyond their range. Man cannot animate matter with his own spirit, or impart to matter,

even temporarily, his own vitality, by any act of will, or any *ideo-motor* power. This would, indeed, be like the act of Prometheus, who transferred stolen fire into inanimate clay. It would be a resolution of all personality, a confusion of the spirit of man with the Holy Spirit of God, an amalgamation of Creator and creature, and an arrogation of Divine attributes to man. Therefore we are shut up to the conclusion, that they who seek guidance and light from inanimate objects are, as the just recompense of their profane curiosity, befooled by evil spirits. This, also, is not new, even in Christian times. It is reported of Simon Magus that he amused his victims by such feats of *léger d'esprit*. Tertullian and other Fathers of the Church inform us of tricks almost precisely similar to those now practised, with both brute matter and brute animals. Unclean spirits, expelled by Christianity out of man as God's temple, have ever been seeking a resting-place, and falling upon manifold devices to procure it. They have at times succeeded. And now that the Son of Man is about to return to judge them, they muster in sevenfold variety and with sevenfold craft, to creep into every province of natural things, and to find entrance into man by every possible avenue, that they may usurp for themselves dominion over those redeemed with Christ's blood whom the Holy Spirit would bring into obedience, not to Himself, but to the Son of Man. The prophet has warned us against familiar spirits that peep and mutter. If ever Scripture was literally fulfilled, it is in those who now neglect his warning. With such spirits Christian men now hold familiar converse. Such they invite to amuse their social circles. The reckless frivolity of such bo-peep with spirits at which thousands now play, is a worse sign of our condition than the rare but serious compacts of a few with Satan which past ages have seen.

It is really too late, in indolent security, to deny the existence of these phenomena. Like all evil works, they may be mixed up with illusion or artifice; but, with every allowance for this, there is more than enough indubitably ascertained to convince us that more than physical agents are at work. To refer all these things to unconscious muscular motion, power of will, vividness of idea, or electric action, is only to violate common sense, in refusing to look reality in the face. We have no alternative between the Spirit of God and the spirits of darkness. And we cannot doubt which is the true side of the alternative. We are told that the thing is innocent. But even if it were not Satanic, its

subversion of God's appointments proves that it is evil. And it cannot be innocent to prostrate ourselves before powers of which we do not know the character. We are told that the thing is useful in commerce, in mining, in medicine, in courts of justice, in dealing with the characters of men, in prevention of sin by a sure means of detection. But what is success in this world—recovery of health, maintenance of justice, preservation from wrong, reformation of morals—if we are debtors to Satan for it all? And what holiness is that which is preserved by the espionage of devils, after the Holy Ghost has failed? We are further told of the faith in God, in spiritual agency, in a future state, thus restored to an unbelieving generation—of the spiritual heights to which men are elevated above the power and defilement of sublunary things—of their holy state, their heavenly experience, their constant guidance, their perfect love—of the prayer with which they approach their experiments—of the mysteries, even touching the being of God, on which they can gaze with undazzled eye—of the destiny, sacred and profane, which they penetrate—of the elysium in which the departed luxuriate—of the social millennium which such revelations inaugurate for the living. What if, in shaking off superstition, they have cast truth away? What if they abolish atheism by deifying nature? What if, in exchanging Satan for physics, they eliminate the Holy Ghost? What if the God whose sanctuary they invade be another than the God and Father of Jesus Christ? What if the spiritual world with which they converse be a pure figment of the liar, and the kingdom which they expect the mere reflex of the day-dreams of the lawless? What if their experience be that of the spiritual opium-eater—their prayer, an invocation on blasphemy—their doctrine, the commentary of the Devil on the Bible—their guidance, an *ignis fatuus*—their love, the cement of apostasy—their holiness, a forgery—their light, sparks of hell—their liberty, the bondage of corruption? What are these new revelations? There is no form of theological error which they do not contain or infer. They confound God and the creature; they deny the divinity of the Son; they identify the spirit of man and the Holy Ghost; they control, correct, and supersede the Scriptures; they substitute spiritual clubs for the Church of God, media for ministers of Christ, and their own shibboleths for sacraments. They profess to be a new dispensation, preparing for a kingdom of which lawlessness is the law, and self the

centre. They call evil a kind of good—madness, a kind of wisdom—misery, a kind of happiness. They declare that all possible religions are alike good; and they proclaim universal salvation.

In one land, where God (who will neither speak nor save but by His own despised ordinances) keeps indignant silence, there are already 30,000 media, who, with forty congregated around each, make at least 1,200,000, chiefly baptized men, who have exchanged Christianity for these principles. Say not that you are safe—that among you these things have been but the harmless bauble of the day—that they are past, and you are as before. What if he who touches these things makes a tacit compact which binds, and enters into a spiritual *rapproch* which cannot be dissolved, save by earnest confession and express absolution? But, be this as it may, by your reception of these things Satan has defiled you with his slime, and accustomed you to his presence. The phenomena may depart, but their influence remains: you are not the same, and you do not occupy the same position as before. Satan has taken your pledge that you will receive him when he next visits you in a new guise. He will claim redemption of the pledge; and, except you thoroughly clear yourself of this guilt, be sure that he will get what he claims.

But if men now seek to spirits that peep and mutter, to whom should ye seek, and exhort others to seek? I answer, to your God. It hath pleased the Father that in Christ all fulness should dwell. All that you can want Christ is able and willing to give. The Spirit of God, whom ye know, because He confesseth Jesus Christ come in the flesh, is among you, sent to bestow on you all the fulness—yea, to make you the fulness—of Christ. He confesses Christ come in the flesh by fulfilling His mission to you—by bringing forth among you the holy and merciful rule, the certain light, the faithful word, and the tender care of Christ. Thus only shall Christ be found in you the hope of glory—thus only shall ye attain to your perfect manhood—so satisfied with good things, that ye shall have no need to seek elsewhere—so armed, as to be proof at all points against the enemy.

See that ye receive, and, according to your vocation, furnish the supply of every just desire: and see that your desires are just.

SHALL TURKEY LIVE OR DIE?

Reprinted verbatim from the Edition of 1854.

SHALL TURKEY LIVE OR DIE?

THE European war now impending differs from the last in every important feature,—in its theatre, its origin, and its issues. Never was a contest more mysterious and unexpected in its rise, more unwelcome to the majority of those engaged in it, and more pregnant with grave yet uncertain consequences. There are three classes of men whose minds it especially occupies. While the religious eschatologist expects a new phase of predicted fulfilment, and the speculative politician a new distribution of territory and influence, the practical man seeks a fuller explication and enforcement of existing interests and obligations. Although they who see in all things the guiding hand of God are warranted to expect that in the communion of the faithful there shall be a divine presentiment of His holy procedure, yet the attempt to map out the future is in too many very idle, and in some most presumptuous. On the other hand, those who try every fresh event by the mere letter of protocols, fail to apprehend its true moral importance, and would bind the God of Providence by the impotent will of man. He that would rightly estimate or improve the present juncture must avoid both of these errors; and while he regards it in its highest aspects, he must not be hurried into foregone conclusions as to its issues.

“Destiny” is the watchword of the day. One horn of the Crescent has long rested on Christendom by destiny. A child of destiny now rules for a second time in the West; and scarcely has he, by assuming, in professed zeal for divine reminiscences, the protectorate of holy places, excited men’s fears lest he should swell the number of those places and convert protectorate into possession, when a new protector of things sacred arises in the North, also pleading the call of destiny.

Why these two protectors have not yet come forth to assert their rights in single combat, and why the Pope, whose throne is upheld and whose claims are asserted by the former, has acted in silence, when he might have been

expected to utter in encyclical letters the Jeremiad of insulted authority, are questions yet to be solved. The religious and political champion of the Papacy is now allied to other Powers on grounds with which Papal claims, religious or political, have nothing ostensibly, at least exclusively, to do. And we now see the northern protector opposed by all the great Powers of Europe,—by the open protest of those who will and can withstand him,—by the tacit resistance of those who fear to be his friends, yet dare not be his foes.

Recent disclosures, however, warrant the conclusion that the Pope has, although covertly, been the prime mover in the present troubles. Using France as a cat's-paw, he has revived in a stronger form his almost obsolete claims to such a protectorate of the Latin interest in the Holy Places as shall, at Jerusalem as elsewhere, swallow up every other. And the aggression of Russia against Turkey derives considerable excuse from the consideration that the Czar, in aiming a fleshly blow at the Sultan, is really aiming a spiritual blow at the Pope. If the Catholic Church or the Christian nations are not in a condition to lift one united testimony against this new assertion of Papal supremacy, we are hardly entitled to complain that one champion throws down the gauntlet of denial, provided that he does not at the same time assert a Græco-Sclavonic supremacy, equally unjust, and, from its novelty, more pregnant with danger. While gentlemen on 'Change or in Downing Street have their minds filled with the merely material aspects of the affair, the man who yields the first place to the interests of Christ's kingdom cannot fail to mark that we are apparently on the eve of that great war of principles which Canning foresaw,—of a religious and European war, the issues of which derive, from their very doubtfulness, only the greater solemnity. While the subsistence of Turkey apparently bars the fulfilment of many Christian hopes, its destruction may, by the means which bring that to pass, greatly endanger the true interests of Christendom, and frustrate the grace of God. And we may yet see the day when the still blinded and impenitent Jew may make greater profit of this new crusade than he did of the former, may step in between the combatants—now on both sides, alas! Christian—and may settle the dispute by establishing his own claim to the land of promise in a way which, although disowned of God till he confess our Messiah, may force, or, as a *pis-aller*, steal, recognition from man.

Leaving to others to decide with the pen those technical questions which the sword, if drawn, will decide without regard to their paper verdict, let us contemplate the attitude of the chief actors in this opening drama. And first of Turkey.

We pray on Good Friday that God would "have mercy upon all—Jews, Turks, Infidels, and heretics—and fetch them home to His fold." As Turks are herein classed with those who have been unfaithful under a divine covenant, the old or the new, it has become customary to regard them as apostates from the faith, who deserve to be abhorred and treated as such. This is, however, a total misconception. Some apostates have indeed become Mahomedans; and it is very questionable whether the talent or experience of such men justifies Christian men and Christian governments in using their services. It may be that the once frequent perversion of Christians to Mahomedanism, under the pressure of persecution, in the days when our prayers were composed, may have dictated this petition. But whatever ravages the false religion of Mahomet may have wrought among Oriental churches and blinded Jews at the first, that religion took its rise among heathen; and the present Turks, although converts to that faith which desolated Eastern Christendom, are well known to have issued from a country where the Christian faith was all but unknown. The conquest of a part of Christendom by the Turks was not an act of apostasy in Mahomedans, but the judgment of God, religious and political, on the unfaithfulness of the Christian Church and State. So that, instead of directing our abhorrence against the rod by which God then smote His people, we should rather humble ourselves because we provoked Him to use it. Although the superstitious and credulous reverence for the theatre of Christ's life on earth has too often, like the blessing of the womb that bare Him, been substituted for the hearing and keeping of His word, yet no devout mind can fail to regard the scenes of His earthly sojourn with awful interest. But the fact that our holy faith went forth from Jerusalem, gave us no right to possess that city. The Christian Church has, as a church, no possession on earth. Rights of property belong to Christian men, not as Christians, but as men. The Jew, not the Christian, forfeited Judea. No people but the Jews have an original divine right to Judea; and while they remain impenitent their right passes over, not to us, but to their conquerors. It is, therefore, more than questionable

whether the Crusaders had any right to attempt the ejection of Mahomedans from the Holy Land. They were more like usurpers than their opponents were; and their conduct was, alas! often too good an argument against their cause. On the other hand, there never was a nobler heathen than the leader of the Mahomedans against the Crusaders. When the Turks, long after, took Constantinople, they did no more than many a heathen conqueror has done before, and many a Christian conqueror since. A living tree was planted where the tree of an effete government had withered away. A Christian conqueror may use his conquest better, just as he has more grace to reign, than a heathen; but his right does not lie in his grace. The "good sword" by which most Christian kings have won and kept their lands, is in itself no better than the "good scimitar" of the Turks; and the conduct of the conqueror of Byzantium towards the faith of his new subjects has often been regarded, especially when we consider the stern tenets which he held, as a model of justice and moderation. There has seldom been a conquest by a people whose religion was their political charter, over a people of a different faith, which bore fewer marks of cruelty. We are, indeed, pointed to the subsequent history of Turkish rule as a proof of its unparalleled wickedness. It is even argued that the Turk, having been during four hundred years put to the proof if he was fit to rule, or capable of conveying any blessing to the conquered, and having been found wanting, has thus forfeited his right; and it is hence concluded that the time is come when he should be dismissed from office, not even by the subjects whom he has oppressed, but by others who have none but a Quixotic right to interfere. Men forget, however, that the form of Turkish oppression has in great part arisen from the circumstance that religious principle and secular law are in Turkey identified. And as to those cruelties and wrongs which are not the offspring of law, but the fruits of its absence or breach, a comparison between Turkish administration and that of many Christian governors would not fall out much to the credit of the latter. We need look no farther than to the country which now acts the champion of Christian wrongs, for a corruption of justice, a cruelty of punishment, and a smothering of true liberty, which Turkey could hardly outdo. And it is well known that, for many centuries, even down to the most recent times, in Egypt, in Syria, nay, in Jerusalem itself, while rival parties of Christians have broken the peace of

society, and disgraced the name of Christ, by their bitter animosities, their dishonest intrigues, and even their bloody strifes, the disciple of the false prophet has often so used his power to maintain good order, so counselled to mutual forbearance, and, as an umpire, so laboured to restore harmony by the adjustment of differences, as to make one blush at the relative positions of the Crescent and the Cross. While it cannot be denied that the passions of the Turk too often trample down all law, the Christians on whom he has trampled either have not yet been tried with power, or, where they have, have abused it almost as much against their own brethren. At this very day, the Turk, bad as he is, is a nobler animal than either the treacherous Greek or the busy Armenian; nay, the Armenians are too often the most efficient instigators of Mahomedan injustice.

It will not, therefore, do for us, like children, to beat the object on which we have wounded ourselves, or bite the rod with which we are chastised. But it may be asked, Are we to forget the zeal of Sobieski, and treat the Turk, not as an enemy and a persecutor, but as a brother? The answer is plain. Not as a brother Christian, but as a brother man. The fact that God has used the Turk to chastise Christendom, and suffered him to plant his temple of falsehood on the sites of the Jewish and the Christian fanes, ought, indeed, to make us search into the reason of the punishment, but does not alter the position or rights of the instrument employed. We dare not treat the Turk as an apostate because he has been the scourge of backsliders, or as a man without rights because his power has been used against us. We may lament the rise of a new heathen delusion, but we have no right to exclude the deluded from the rights of man. We may lament that a territory redeemed from the ocean of Paganism has been again submerged; but if the right of conquest is admitted in the law of Christendom, we cannot disown it in the law of the world. The Eastern Empire itself gained its place by conquest; and, granting the validity of its territorial rights so acquired, it alone was entitled, and, if it could rise again, would be entitled, to vindicate these. Supposing that the Turk had no title to Turkey, surely England, France, Russia, and Austria have as little right to expel him as he to be there. And the fact that they are *Christian* nations invests them with no new rights or political privilege. The providence of God has indeed so ordered that a knot of States in one quarter of the globe have in common embraced Christianity, and thereby

risen to the head of the nations; and in many points of view, Christendom, as a collective whole, does form and can act as a corporate unity, or commonwealth.

It may well be questioned, however, whether the boasted balance of power in Europe, and even the Holy Alliance, have not tended to impair national integrity by unwarranted interference. Each Christian monarch has none over him but Christ; all others are but his brethren. Their totality has no authority over him in his own kingdom. And although each nation may justly protest, as each householder may, against those acts of another which affect its just interests, and ought to do its best, by remonstrance, in the cause of truth, yet no nation derives a right from its imagined spirituality or orthodoxy to dictate the internal administration of another; and as with individuals, so no aggregate of nations has, as an European Peace Society, a right to prescribe to any one nation terms which it shall observe on pain of war, unless that nation has consented to such arbitration. But be this as it may, if the Christian commonwealth is to exhibit its corporate action, either by waging Quixotic war on the heathen, or by the united repulse of an inroad on that part of its sacred territory which any one State may own and can forfeit, or by creating itself a premature arbiter over the possession of the earth, or by so trampling on the integrity of heathen nations, as to violate the rights of men in order to maintain the integrity of the Church and vindicate the rights of God,—it had better never have existed than perpetrate such a confusion of things heavenly and earthly, and thus build up religion on the ruins of justice. Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil. This applies to the law of nature as truly as to the law of Moses. Fallen though man be, and prone to evil, there is a conscience of right and wrong, as between man and man, in every clime and creed; and the first duty of those who would enlighten the consciences of men by heavenly truth, is to see that they do not claim or take licence to outrage the first principles of natural justice. The rights of heathen men and States (nay, of apostates) in things pertaining to this world are as sacred as those of Christians. Faith in Christ is (save by special covenant) the condition of no monarch's tenure, of no State's existence. And if the Turk, as a man, has as good a right as a Christian to breathe the air, Turkey, as a State, has as good a claim to subsist and be recognized by other States as England or China has. Its right would not be strengthened by

its conversion, and is not impaired by its infidelity. The spiritual, although superior to the natural, does not abolish or despise it. The domination of Turkey may injure Christendom; but the right way to be rid of this is not to deny or violate its national rights, but to confess and renounce the moral and spiritual declension, the heresy, schism, demoralization, and other sins in the early Eastern Church, of which that domination is the condign punishment.

In this light, the Crusades, by whatever zeal for God called forth, exhibited, apart from all their attendant moral evils, an evident obliteration of moral duty by fancied religious obligation, and a trampling on natural rights in search of a spiritual object, wrongly apprehended and wrongly pursued. The deliverances of Europe by Martel on the one hand, and Sobieski on the other, from subjection to Mahomedan rule, although they effected so signal a rescue for the faith, derived their justification, as political events, not from the fact that the oppressive Power was Mahomedan, but from the simple fact that it was an oppressive Power.

The anomalous situation of the Pope, as being at once a claimant of œcumenic supremacy and one of the temporal heads of Europe, has shown itself in the anomalous attitude which he has assumed towards the Turk. As long as he was true to his own principles he never consented to stand in diplomatic relations to the Porte. In assuming to act as the sole spiritual and temporal head of all Christendom, he refused to acknowledge a heathen intruder into his supposed domain. But the wrong way in which he expressed this refusal was, by withholding, as a temporal sovereign, that diplomatic recognition to which the Sultan, as another temporal sovereign, no longer at war with him, was entitled. And the recognition which he has lately given was the result, not of true insight into the distinction between his own spiritual and temporal characters, but of decaying zeal for God. His former motive was a right one; but the conduct which it dictated was mistaken. With the failure of the motive his conduct has changed; but his insight has not improved.

The Christian nations of Europe, even those that acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, withheld their diplomatic recognition of Turkey, not on purely religious grounds, but because Turkey remained, as it were, habitually a politically inimical Power. Gradually the enmity subsided; and, in consequence, although the religious obligation, if true, remains in its full force, every Christian government now

finds itself in diplomatic relations with the Porte, on the simple ground of secular parity among civilized nations, be they English, Russian, Chinese, Persians, or Turks.

Yet while the political recognition of Turkey is right, there may be wrong grounds for doing a right thing—a right thing may be overdone; and the diplomatic relations of a Christian with a heathen nation ought, from the nature of things, never to be so intimate as those with a Christian government. In these respects England does seem to have erred. We cannot shut our eyes to the fact, that the almost unbroken amity of England with Turkey has arisen from our commercial and territorial jealousy of other Powers, that self-interest has reconciled us to intimate contact with those who count all Christians “dogs,” and that to talk continually of “our good friend and staunch ally, the Turk,” argues either a blunting of our spiritual aversion to a blasphemous form of Paganism, or a lulling of conscience for mammon’s sake. Nor is it an uninstructional example of the truth, that brethren at strife are the most irreconcilable of all men (Prov. xviii. 19), that the same nation which shrinks with sacred horror and blind alarm from diplomatic relations with Rome (not on the ground that Rome should not be, or is not, an European State, but on the ground that the head of that State is at the same time usurping a false spiritual place) should, without any qualm of conscience, give the hand of political brotherhood to a government, the whole code of which is based upon the words of an impostor who has superseded Christ. At the same time we cannot accuse England of securing the favour of Turkey at the expense of the Christians who are subjected to Mahomedan rule. There never was a more unjust reproach than that raised by certain religionists against England, that she appears at the Court of the Sultan as a Christian Power taking the side of the oppressor against his Christian subjects. Navarino is a witness to the reverse.

Be the cause of the Greek nation good or bad, none have been its warmer or more sincere supporters than the English. So powerful an element in our motives for the support of Greece was the desire to emancipate Christianity from a Mahomedan yoke, that, in order to attain this end, England ran the risk of weakening, by the emancipation of Greece, the bulwark which she found in Turkey against the advances of Russia. And for a long series of years no part of the policy of England has been more unvarying than her resolution, expressed by deeds, to employ her just influence

at the Porte in the most unwearied and enlightened disinterestedness, by embracing—often at great sacrifices and risks, and with singular success—every opportunity to plead the cause of the Christian population in the East, although belonging to a different section of the Church from her own. In this respect she may well bear comparison with any other Power, especially with one which, although it seeks to blind the pious by vaunting itself the protector of Oriental Christianity, has done little or nothing for the co-religionists of its own subjects, save to entice them, through a proposed ecclesiastical union, into a political subjugation which they abhor.

But this leads us to speak of Russia, the new protector of Oriental Christians. If the other European Governments had in due time, either independently or in concert with England, lifted as constant and sincere a protest as hers at the Court of Turkey against the wrongs of these Christians, and had required with one voice that the Government should administer its laws impartially to all its subjects, irrespective of their creed, we might have heard less of this new protectorate, and should, by an act of justice and mercy, have foreclosed the present flimsy pretexts of Russia. But the weakness of Christian zeal, our indifference between Christ and Belial, and the absence of Christian concord, have prevented this; and by our "*lâches*" we have furnished the pretexts against which we now exclaim. But let us consider for a moment who the helper and helped are. Even granting that the professions of Russia were true in the letter, there is surely no one so blindly charitable as to believe that, however sincere the ill-informed masses in Russia may be in the fanatical excitement to which they have been goaded, the Czar or his advisers have either tears of compassion on their eyelids or indignation in their hearts at the wrongs of Oriental Christians. Without entering into the maze of diplomacy, or attempting to interpret treaties intentionally Delphic, it may suffice to observe that the general plea now urged by Russia formed no part of her original demands, but was resorted to *lest* those should be satisfied. The Czar has two characters. He is, in the first place, the spiritual head of the Russian Church. But he is not, and knows that he is not, the spiritual head of the whole Greek Church; still less of the Armenians, Nestorians, or any other Oriental body of Christians; and least of all of those united to Rome. Each Oriental Church has its own proper patriarch or other supreme head. And the Czar has

no more right, on any religious ground, to throw down the gauntlet as the champion of those other Churches, than the Pope or the Archbishop of Canterbury. That they are neither Romanist nor Protestant is no ground, provided they are not Russian; that their faith or rites are more akin to, nay, even identical with his own, is no ground. He has no authority, human or divine, for taking such a place as the universal champion of the East. He never pretends that members of the Russian Church are among the persecuted, save a few pilgrims; yet he does not limit his care to these. He is, indeed, in the second place, the Autocrat of all the Russias. But there is no pretence that any part of his dominions has been seized or invaded. Therefore, neither as temporal nor as spiritual head has he a vestige of claim to interfere individually, on the abstract ground of right. All that he could do would be to unite with other Christian Powers in representations to the Porte. To the necessity of making these the other Christian Powers are now awakened—too late, indeed, to prevent the solitary aggressions of Russia, but assuredly not too late to bring out the utter groundlessness of her pretensions.

It has always been the artful endeavour of the Czar to place his opponents at a disadvantage by bringing them at each step into a position in which they shall appear aggressors. He crosses the Pruth, professing not to declare war thereby, but merely to take a precautionary pledge for the fulfilment of treaties; and because Turkey justly regarded his act as a declaration of war, he calls Turkey the aggressor. He insists on fighting out with Turkey alone a quarrel in which all European Powers have, by his acts, become interested; and because they act on this conviction, he calls them aggressors for interfering in a private quarrel. He has forced the fleets of Europe to occupy the Euxine, as he the Provinces; and, after seeing them where they would not be if neutral, and being told how far their defence of the weaker part would go, he seeks by the question of a simpleton to throw on us the stigma of being the first to declare war. But the cloven foot has been unmistakably revealed by his rejection of the proposal of the Four Powers to insist on and obtain a protectorate for all Christians under Turkish sway. And in assigning, as the ground of that rejection, that he will not suffer any interference with his sole right of protection, he virtually arrogates to himself a right which they who are its objects disallow, which no treaty ever did or could confer upon him, and which the

other Powers of Europe cannot permit him to plead. In fact, his claim of protectorate would cover almost every class but the only one of which he is protector. He cannot be claiming from Turkey a right to protect the Russian Church. That right is not interfered with by Turkey, or any one else. And of those whom he does claim to protect, every class, however hostile to Turkey, would infinitely prefer the rule of Turkey, mollified by Christian diplomacy, to the temporal rule of the Czar. To this last his religious protectorate would infallibly lead; for, if the two characters of spiritual and temporal head are inseparable in his person in Russia, who shall separate them in Turkey, whenever he has the power to exhibit both? Moreover, why rest in the mere protectorate of Christians? What if the Jew also should become an object of pity to the Czar, and he should extort Syria from the Turk for the Jew, who has certainly a better claim to Palestine than the Greek to Turkey?

It may, however, be argued that all speculations as to abstract rights are superseded by treaties, the terms of which must be kept, and by which Turkey and other Powers have recognized the right of Russia to insist in such as her present demands, and to occupy the Provinces as she does.

To this it must be replied, that one of the very questions at issue is, whether such compacts as those alleged exist, whether they are capable of the interpretation put upon them by Russia, and whether they justify the occupation of the Provinces? As to the latter, Russia pleads the precedent of her previous occupation, unquestioned by the European Powers. But, instead of justifying the one by the other, we should rather deny the justice of both. On the former occasion the cause of Russia may have been good; but the goodness of the motive can never legalize an illegal act. The former occupation should not have been allowed. By not being awake, we let in the wedge, and we are now suffering the penalty of having listened to the dangerous doctrine that the end sanctifies the means. Let us disown so bad a precedent. The thing which Russia seeks to do is, single-handed, to extort from Turkey pledges, or the fulfilment of alleged pledges, as to her own internal administration, the giving or fulfilling of which would be a surrender of her national integrity, in order virtually, though not yet nominally, to use her as a province and thoroughfare. This must not be. If the administration of Turkey becomes a public nuisance, it must be abated by the public

verdict of nations ; but it may not be corrected by a single nation which, while it has no peculiar right to interfere, has a peculiar interest in spoiling the offender. If Russia has already injured Turkey, and stolen a march on Europe by treaty, now is the time, when the operation of treaties is suspended, to see that the evil is not repeated or prolonged, but repaired ; and if, having not yet done it, she now attempts it, every lover of fair-play must forbid her. Let us not forget, while treaties are talked of (and, in so far as advantageous, so religiously asserted), that the position of Turkey in Europe has the sanction of treaties without number, framed not in ignorance of what she was, but knowing it well. If the nations of Europe had persisted in refusing to acknowledge such an intrusive and persecuting Power, and had provided, as the first condition of conceding to it, by diplomatic recognition, a place in the European commonwealth, that it should afford to its Christian subjects the same advantages as they should have enjoyed under Christian rule, or at least that it should administer equal laws to Christians and Turks, the case would now be widely different. But it was not so. Europe took Turkey as she found it ; and whatever immunities have since been granted by Turkey to Christians, these have in so far been acts of free grace, that they were no original conditions of the entrance of Turkey into the European federation. In short, it is far too late to put Turkey on her trial as a candidate for her place. It was never said to the Turk, We shall take proof of you for a century or two by your conduct before we admit you. He has, on all secular grounds of public law, as good a right to his place as we have to ours. We may, indeed, be bound by no treaty to maintain Turkey, but we are bound by justice to see that it is fairly dealt with. At all events, let us do one thing or the other. Abolish Turkey with one consent, if you will, provided you know what next to do ; but if you deem its abolition undeserved, if you cannot put Greece in its place, or agree how to divide the spoil, defend it from all thieves and robbers in the meantime. Here justice and interest are at one.

We may regret that the Turk is there, but we dare not turn him out by the shoulder in our indignation. We must wait till that Higher Power which sent him shall withdraw him.

No European confederacy, then, still less any single nation, can force Turkey out of Europe by resolving to impose new conditions on it which it will not or cannot accept. Yet we do not counsel the folding of the arms in a resigna-

tion which borders on fatalism. It may come to pass that Turkey, like any other nation, may so change for the worse its original character, and may so sin against that common law of nations which is more sacred than any statute or treaty, that, as madmen are put by their neighbours in a strait waistcoat, and they who offend against society are sent to Coventry, Turkey may provoke surrounding governments to vote it out of Europe.* "Necessity has no law." But has Turkey so acted? On the contrary, however far its conduct towards Christians in the East may fall short of that ideal standard by which Russia now takes a fancy to measure it, has there not been for a long time, with occasional exceptions, a marked and steadily progressive improvement in the exercise of its now declining government as regards them? It would need some sudden and flagrant excess to justify the arming of Europe against it, still more to warrant the zeal of such a solitary champion as the Czar.

But is there no other Power which threatens to become, rather than Turkey, a public offender? Are the instinctive and constant apprehensions of all Europe on the side of Russia pure hallucinations? Are they not so strong as to survive every fresh apprehension from France? Is not every help which Russia has lent against revolutionary principles accepted with suspicion, as insincere—with a grudge, as dearly bought—with dread, as dangerous to European liberty? Whatever ties may bind the Court of Russia to others, is it not notorious that the hatred of the whole German people to Russia is such, that no German monarch dare tax the loyalty or the pockets of his people in behalf of Russia, and each may count upon both against her?

Are we so blinded by the spirit of selfish reaction, and so contracted by the spirit of party, as to see none but those proximate evils which the brute can feel, to apprehend danger from nothing but rebellion, and to see wickedness in none but the radicals of Western Europe? Or are we such devotees to the mere catchwords of Christianity, and so given up to believe the religious phrases which political craft takes up into its mouth (in order to instigate its friends and paralyze its foes), as to be blind to the realities of things, and deaf to the claims both of interest and of justice? Is our vision so filled with the Antichrist who denies God, that we have no corner for him who confesses Him? Or have we so pinned our faith to the Antichrist of Rome or Republicanism that

* See last paragraphs, page 433.

we have no watchfulness left for the great Antichrist of the North, who has lifted his paw to appropriate the spiritual crown of Christ, whose name stands parallel with that of God in the hearts of his serfs, and on the buildings of his realm; and who, at the time dictated by Scythian cunning, will mount his chariot to drive like a modern Jehu in his zeal for the Lord? Are we Englishmen prepared, after contesting it with those who have paved the way into the East under cloud of night, to look on when the journey is undertaken in broad day? Are we prepared to hail the tyranny of the knout, and the treachery of the bribe, as a blessed substitute for the flash of the scimitar and the grasp of the spoiler? Are we who, when the fancy took us to be suspicious, could hardly listen to the pacific assurances of France, ready to swallow any assurance from a government which is the impersonation of craft, and the tallowy unmoved countenance of which never yet betrayed its passions or projects? Do we believe that those who bide their time in silence are less dangerous than those who anticipate it with bluster? Do we dream that Russia has become such an unwieldy mass, as to endanger us only by its fall? Or do we regard the hordes of the North, which have more than once overrun Europe in savage disorder, as being incapable of doing so again in imperial order? If we do, it is time that we thought otherwise.

Now is the time. War is a sad calamity everywhere, and a shameful thing among Christian nations. Let us beware of being those to bring it recklessly on; but, if it must come, let us beware of avoiding it by ruin to ourselves or others. Russia has, by her own act, set us free from our own former relations to her; let us see to it that our new relations be more secure. Let her not make the Black Sea a "mare clausum;" let her not make the Baltic a "mare clausum;" let her not make the Danube a "fluvium clausum,"—an European pipe with a Russian plug; let her not make Bornholm a Russian arsenal, the Cattegat a Russian strait, Scandinavia a Russian province, Denmark a Russian landing-place, or Persia a Russian highway. Rather let the Caucasus be secured against future butchery, and Courland, Liefland, and Finland be restored to their natural owners.

Meantime, let none who must not, meddle in the fray; but let none who ought, waver. Let them take the right side, and do it heartily; for while decision saves blood, indecision may forfeit all. We may push neutrality into self-contradiction. And while we strike *at a distance*, let us not

lay ourselves bare *at home*. There are such things as political feints. Moreover, if Austria, through poverty or gratitude, or Prussia, through family ties, shall be won or neutralized by Russia, let them remember that they do it at the almost certain risk of intestine rebellion, and of being despoiled in Italy and on the Rhine by foreign conquest.

Though we believe in the sure word of prophecy, we must beware of its private or premature interpretation. And while we ought not, on the one hand, to be paralyzed in doing our duty by prophetic anticipations, neither dare we, on the other, excite ourselves to any breach of duty by a desire to see these realized. God will remove all oppressive powers which stand in His way. But there are wicked powers enough in the earth to do His work of judgment, whether on His Church or on her enemies. We may not be our own saviours; we may not arise, in self-will, to carry out God's counsels. It is our part to expect His salvation in the way of strict duty. Men may speculate about the drying up of the Euphrates and the restoration of the Jews to their land, as they please. We shall best commend ourselves to God, not by skilful calculations as to the rate at which, or the manner in which, the chariot of His Church, as the mystery of His Coming Kingdom, rolls along the highways of His providence, but rather by ourselves abiding in the chariot, and trusting to the goodness of its Guide. And the sole true foundation on which we can build up the nobler superstructure of holiness, is scrupulous righteousness between nation and nation, between man and man. He only that has clean hands shall prosper in his deed.

One word more: The votaries of reaction insist that Turkey shall be blotted out as the gathering-place of all revolutionary spirits. But why is it so? Not because the policy of Turkey is revolutionary, but because he who has been the fulcrum of reaction has, by declaring war against Turkey, opened Turkey for them as a door by which they can attack him, and has justified Turkey in using them. Bad, nay blasphemous, as revolutionists may be, he who would hunt them out of the earth must have an unclean conscience himself. He must feel that he has not been the Shepherd of his people, and that he has more coveted the fleece than loved the flock.

PLEADINGS WITH MY MOTHER:

THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

The Substance of Lectures delivered in Edinburgh, 1854.

“Plead with your mother, plead ; for she is not my wife, neither am I her husband” (Hos. ii. 2).

“I prayed therefore unto the Lord, and said, O Lord God, destroy not Thy people and Thine inheritance, which Thou hast redeemed through Thy greatness. Remember Thy servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; look not unto the stubbornness of this people, nor to their wickedness, nor to their sin. . . . Yet they are Thy people and Thine inheritance” (Deut. ix.).

PLEADINGS WITH MY MOTHER:

THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND.

As a native of Scotland and a son of the Scottish Church, I bring, in the following pages, a tribute of loyalty to my land, and of piety towards my Mother. There may be nothing new or striking in them, but I believe them to be useful.

The text which best illustrates the Lectures here given to the public, is to be found in the Epistle of Paul to Titus. "These things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men" (Titus iii. 8).

It is worthy of note, that, in those parts of the Christian Church which lay most stress on good works, morality is, with certain noble exceptions, at its lowest ebb; and that, in those which lay most stress on faith, the triumphs of faith are rare. It is also observable that, where the authority of Christ's ministers is most asserted, obedience to His truth is little seen; and that, where the use of the Scriptures is most free, the knowledge of God's counsel is, notwithstanding, very limited.

How are these paradoxes to be explained? Not by questioning the blessing of moral instruction, the power of faith, the divine authority of the ministry, or the inspiration of Holy Writ; but by confessing that the works insisted on are not truly good—that the faith which is current is spurious—that the authority exercised is fleshly, and that the Scriptures possessed are not rightly read. The fault must be with us; for God is faithful. And assuredly, if we take the right course, He will never fail to give the right issue.

Man can do no good works; God alone can. The Son of God came in flesh to abolish all works of man, and establish only those of God; yet that which God works in and by the redeemed man is as absolutely good as He by whose

grace it is wrought. We may all do despite to the Spirit of grace; yet the truth stands, that what is born of God cannot sin. Our works, when wrought in God, proceed from Him; therefore they come fearlessly to the light; and they are, not by a fiction, but really, worthy of reward. He that doeth God's commandments hath right to the tree of life.

The great Apostle of faith calls the obligation to good works a thing to be affirmed constantly. He bids Titus not merely to teach as to their connection with faith, but perseveringly to insist on their being done. (See Titus ii., iii.)

We all acknowledge that saving faith is the gift of God, and the source of holiness. Man cannot bestow it on himself; and when he has it, he is virtually possessed of all grace. It constitutes the living power of every joint and band by which, in the divine organization of the Church as a body, we are bound to Christ the Head. Therefore men wrestle for faith, and Satan labours to deprive them of it. But it is a great mistake to think that our conflict for faith is our only conflict, that so, if it be crowned with success, all else will come of itself. On the contrary, it is only begun. As all men on earth should have faith, so all men in Christ should do good works. But, in order to this, we must be victors in a continual conflict. In wrestling for faith, we seek our own good; in wrestling for good works, we seek the honour of God.

The devils believe and tremble; the saints believe and bear fruit. But between these two extremes there lies a region, occupied by the great mass of well-disposed persons, in which we see faith without either terror or fruitful joy. There is a faith not devilish, yet dead; there are branches in the vine fruitless, and therefore in peril of excision; there is a living in the Spirit, without walking in it.

Whence comes such a solecism? I answer, From our false conceptions of holiness.

We are justly accustomed to look with pity on the corrupted heathen, who seeks to please God with crime—on the blinded Jew, as the bondsman of ceremonial trifles—on the hermit, fugitive from the world without finding God—on the self-exposure of the stylite—on the will-worship of the superstitious formalist, and on the paralyzed quietism of the mystic, as instances of the extent to which the ingenious vexation of the old man can be mistaken for the

willing service of the new. But while we are exempt from these forms of error, are we exempt from that in which they take their origin, namely, in regarding holiness as something else than the operation of our divine life in doing God's commandments, and in doing those commandments especially which God addresses to ourselves?

Holiness is not a mere state or condition. If we so think of it, we shall assuredly fall into a snare suited to our notions of that condition. We shall be ever tormenting or flattering ourselves with the search for evidence of that condition. When we have got them, there we shall rest. And in resting there, we rest in a thing which has nothing whatever to do with the doing of God's will in earth as it is done in Heaven. A holy state (as men speak) is a mere creature of fancy. He that does God's will needs no evidence of the fact.

But there is also even a doing of God's commandments which is not holiness, because it is not doing those commandments which He gives to us. God setteth men in the world, and members in the Body of Christ, as it pleaseth Him; and only where He sets us do His commandments bind us. In doing commandments addressed to others we may prove our zeal, but we do not please Him, and cannot count on His help. Such conduct is the fruit of arrogance, and the inlet of danger. Against such false holiness the Apostle bears witness when he defines good works to be "*things good* [fair or beautiful] and profitable unto men." He calls them things fair to look upon, or beautiful. These things are, in the first place, that fulfilment of our relative duties which commends itself to mankind who behold it. To these does the exhortation refer, that we should think on all things true and seemly, just and pure, lovely and of good report, if there be any virtue and any praise, in order to show forth the praises of Christ, and by our good conversation, so put the foolish to silence, that men, seeing our works, may glorify God. And these things are, in the second place, that fulfilment of our duties to God which He can look upon with delight. But the Apostle also calls them things profitable unto men, that is, things by which, whether men approve or disapprove our conduct, we assist men in that which God wills concerning them—things by which we contribute, not to the gratification of men's wishes, but to the fulfilment of God's purposes, and bring to men the help of God, either in deliverance from evil, or in leading them on to perfection in Christ.

Paul tells us to be careful to maintain these things, or rather, to stand at the head of them—preside over them (*προιστημι*)—or to see to their performance. He contemplates the position of the Christian Church as standing isolated in the van of mankind, as called to set an example to all, of those duties which God expects from all, as furnished with the power to perform those duties better than all other men, and as charged with the superintendence of all men in the performance of these duties. To us he says, “Maintain these things,” or, as in the first verse of the chapter, “Be ye the readiest of the ready unto every good work.”

Mark, he does not merely say, “Be ye diligent in every good work,” but “Be ye ready” (*ἑτοιμος*). Our readiness consists in two things: desire to work, and knowledge what to do. The former God kindles in our hearts, the latter we must take trouble to obtain out of the inspired Scriptures, that sacred depository of God’s will, which cannot indeed itself speak, but out of which they who teach us God’s ways must draw that doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness whereby we are thoroughly furnished unto all good works. But he that stands ready waits not for his own impulse, but for the bidding of another, and does not that which he fancies, but that which he is commanded to do. Hence the Apostle associates this readiness with subjection to those who rule over us. God is our only ruler. Rule on earth is the effluence and symbol of His; and as we prove our obedience to Him by our obedience to earthly rulers, so do we prove our alacrity in doing His will, by our alacrity in doing theirs, and our acknowledgment of His claims, by our acknowledgment of theirs; as it is written, “For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing.” To cheat the king or to murmur against taxes, is the worst of all dishonesty or discontent. A grudging subject cannot be a faithful Christian.

There are Christians who, dissociating the God of grace from the God of providence, and either seeking an excuse for lawlessness, or puffed up in imagined spirituality, plead their Christian standing or attainments as an exemption from the duty of loyalty. They look down on earthly rulers and those whom they control, as belonging to the category of carnal things, above which they stand on a vantage-ground of Christian light and liberty. They regard the affairs and interests of society as things with which the spiritual, whether occupied with their own souls or with a heavenly kingdom,

have nothing to do. And while they will condescend to pray for those in authority, they pray for them merely as for the godless and unconverted. They see no divine ordinance in a king, unless he is in their estimation a pious man.

But Paul, whom the Church, idolizing Peter, has generally left to Radicals and Dissenters, here redeems his character as the great teacher of the nations, by holding very different language. In charging Timothy against those who would give novel versions of our duty, understanding neither what they teach, nor on what duties they insist (1 Tim. i.), he sets it forth as our first duty, to pray for all men. He names those in authority, as the first for whom we ought to pray. And he commends them to our prayers, not, as many present religionists would say, that they may be converted or abdicate their power, but that we may be kept in order and benefited by them; being, through them, enabled to lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. In other words, the Apostle shows that, in praying for them, we are praying for ourselves, because we pray that they may be enabled to keep us, for whose welfare, though not by whose grace, they reign. Although the elect alone shall be saved, it is God's will that all men should be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. The ordinances of the Church are His great means towards this end. By them only can men be perfected as heirs of His kingdom, and prepared not merely for being blessed by Christ, but for ruling with Him. Yet He has collateral and subsidiary means, of wider application than the ordinances of the Church, which cannot be passed by, if ecclesiastical ordinances are to operate wholesomely upon us. These are the ordinances of society, which touch every man, Christian or heathen, saint or sinner, alike. By their appointment God at the first showed His will to save all men, and by their preservation He assures men that the day of grace is not passed. They are the natural, which precedes the spiritual—the preparatory school for those who are to learn higher things in the more advanced school of the Church. They teach men to be righteous, that they may be in the right condition for learning to be holy. Not that men can practise righteousness in the world without the grace of God, but that, under that grace, they must be trained in righteousness before they are advanced to the higher walk of holiness. It is the scandal of the Christian name that men meddle with holy things, as saints, who are not

righteous as men—yea, too often make these holy things an excuse or atonement for the neglect of social duties. There are as many that say “Corban” among us as among the Jews. And we can conceive no spectacle more sad than that presented wherever it is creditable to be religious—the spectacle of men whose mouths are filled with pious phraseology, whose thoughts are occupied with divine mysteries, or their hands with religious works—who frequent the house of God, who figure upon platforms and in lists of subscribers, and who snuff the incense of mutual compliment—and yet who, in all those relations which put men to the practical proof, and find out what they are without their company manners and their holiday dress—in their domestic circles, in their daily business, in their duties of justice and mercy, in public loyalty, in private kindness, in sincerity of speech, in singleness of eye—in abstinence from slander, strife, and revenge—in contentment with a low place, or meekness in a high one—in denial of self—in mortifying of unholy lusts—present a miserable contrast, at which regarding angels may weep, and they who call religion a sham may well triumph. And if the superstructure of holiness must fall unless it rest on the basis of righteousness, so can those learn nothing aright of heavenly mysteries in the Church who do not fulfil their natural obligations in the world. This is the order of God, which none may overleap with impunity. As we pray for parents that they may control us and keep us from our own courses, so do we pray for kings. And they who would do good works must be fit and ready to do what kings, masters, and parents tell them, with the alacrity of those who, in so doing, serve the Lord Christ. These are not spiritual busybodies. They are the only true doers of good. One who is not under authority can do nothing aright.

So much for our duties in common with all men. But the Church—that is, all they who, as our Westminster Confession hath it, “are grafted into Christ”—have duties peculiar to themselves.

It is not a little extraordinary, it might well excite a smile from the Jew or the infidel, and it certainly must cripple our powers of well-doing, that Christians differ so widely in their definitions of the Church. Scripture abounds in such definitions. These are intended to be combined together. And they can be—because Scripture is one. But as the various sections into which the Church has been so lamentably divided have each appropriated, with exagge-

ration and distortion, certain parts of truth, by the long maintenance of which they are blinded to other parts, so do we find in the mouth of every section a different and often a contradictory definition of the Church. Some have extended it to all faithful men in every age and under every covenant. Others have limited it to the hierarchy alone. And the majority have defined the Church by those qualities which the Church should, according to them, especially exhibit—those tenets which she should especially maintain, or those rites which she should especially observe; each party being guided in the selection of qualities, tenets, and rites by its own idiosyncrasy and traditional prejudices. Nay, those who most parade the dogma of unity are herein as schismatic as their neighbours. To describe the Church by that which forms her essence, and to adhere in practice to that definition, has occurred to few or none.

Now the essence of the Church is, that she is of Christ, sprung of Him—distinct from Him, yet one with Him. The essence of a Christian is, that he is a member of Christ. This mystery we cannot fathom or describe as a physical phenomenon. But we are furnished by Holy Scripture with a help to its contemplation, in the two symbols of a *body* and a *vine*, of which the Son of God, made man, is the head and the root. And from these we see that, as no brute matter could make itself a member of the human body, or the branch of a vine, so no mere spontaneous volition or action of man can make him a member of Christ. To use the simile of the vine, he must, however well prepared for the place, be grafted in by a definite act of God. When grafted in, he partakes of the life of the root. Yet he is capable of quenching that life, and of becoming a withered branch; and, although no other power can pluck him out of the vine, the Hand that grafted him in can take him away, and will do so if he is fruitless.

As all visible truth answers to that which is in the adorable Trinity, so all error betrays itself by its collision with that which is true of God. Mariolatry is the sign of ecclesiolatry. Men may, indeed, quibble about the nature and extent of the false honour paid to the Blessed Virgin by that part of the Church which treats her as the complement of the Godhead. And they may wrangle as to the place and offices which they assign to the Church in the economy of grace. But as we see, on the one hand, those who all but adore the mother of our Lord, and on the other, those who neglect their bounden duty to call her blessed, so

do we see, on the one hand, those who supplant Christ by the Church (calling all doctrine, discipline, and grace *hers*) and, on the other, those who deny to her her proper place as the helpmeet for Christ. These last, in passing by all her divine machinery as a daring interposition of something human, in order to deal, as they say, immediately with the Lord, forget that He has pledged Himself to be found in that machinery, as His own appointment; and thus they purchase communion with Christ at the expense of all the mutual offices of His members. It is enough, however, for us to hold immovably fast, that Christ is the only Saviour and Judge; and yet that, wherever He appoints any work to be done by man in His name, it is our duty devoutly to expect that He will come forth for its performance, and religiously to abstain from seeking it obstinately, lawlessly, or mystically elsewhere. To ascribe to the creature the attributes of Christ, is blasphemy. But to seek Him in any way in which He has not promised to be found, is superstition, whether it be in Popish relics or Protestant favourites. There is no safety against idols but by finding Christ, who filleth all in all. And if we seek Him where He is not, we shall miss Him. With our pious horror at the Deist, who would pass by Christ in dealing with God, let us also beware of those who would extort or impetrate the blessing of Christ, while they despise those sacraments and ordinances which are the channels of that blessing.

Our text informs us that the Church has a twofold duty: to do things pleasing to God, and to do things useful to men. Although the former is in one sense the higher duty, we shall first consider the latter.

When we speak of the usefulness of the Church, we do not mean that of the ministers of religion only. Nor do we mean the relative duties of all individual Christians. Nor do we mean the duties of the Church to the heathen and the Jew merely. We mean the action of the Church as one body, by those organs and in those forms which the respective places and offices of her members indicate. God has set in the Church certain persons having certain offices. Their functions are not their own. They are the functions of the whole body, as those of the whole body are of Christ the Head. And yet, by His appointment, they are to be exercised peculiarly by these particular members. It is even as in the natural body, in which one life operates throughout, yet operates, in one member by seeing and not hearing, in another by hearing

and not seeing. The action of these members is directed partly to the other members (so that by the possession of a common life, and by mutual good offices, they are seen as members one of another), and partly to all external to the body, so that the Church is seen as the benefactor of the world. And even where the members act towards one another, their action may be seen, either in things strictly ecclesiastical, in their capacity as members; or in things human, as having common interests with all men.

Christ promised the Comforter to abide with us, when He should go, till His return. This made His going expedient. But if our condition with the Comforter in Christ's absence is not better than the condition of His disciples during His presence, how has the coming of the Comforter helped us? Of what use is the Comforter? In like manner, Christ has sent His Church into the world, as the Father sent Him, informed with all His knowledge, inspired with all His love, endowed with all His saving power. But if the Church cannot bring to men the help and blessings of Christ, of what use is she? Is she the salt of the earth? Is she worth the place that men have given to her, and their expense and pains in upholding her? Does she not deserve to be abolished as a make-believe? God has called upon all men to take Him for their portion; and in Christ they find Him. In having Christ, men are rich, because they have at once the mortification of every evil desire, and the fulfilment of every good one. Christ has made the Church the minister of His grace in this world, and of His glory in the next. And as it would be at variance with the justice of God to call men to Christ if they could not find in Him all that their nature and circumstances required, also so would it be unjust to invite men into the Church if they could not find in her all the guidance and blessing which Christ has for men. Men would be justified in looking back to what they had left, in which they had such supply of their desiderata as they could find. And their murmurings, like those by Israel of old, would be not without reason. The proper condition of the Church's tenure in this world is, that she supplies all the just wants of man, both as a man and as a member of Christ. She did this, in some measure, at the first. Has she done it since? Does she do it now? Shall she ever do it again? And if so, how?

Wherein does this supply consist? Let us, in considering the solution of the problem, bear in mind the true nature of the problem itself. Forasmuch as man is a

creature, and represents all other creatures, it is his nature to be under authority and to need help. But forasmuch as man is made in the image of God, he is also a self-determining agent; not merely like the brutes who obey an impulse, but having the power of weighing motives, and judging between right and wrong, ere he determines for either. These are the two poles of his being—antagonist, yet not opposed. His whole being and action, like all nature, is composed of antagonisms. It cannot subsist without them. They act, not by neutralizing each other, but by combination with each other. When they are all in their right place and proportion, they work in harmony. The disposition of man to submit to authority and seek guidance will never, while man continues in his right relations, conflict with his independent spontaneity. But if these relations are disordered, the one will overbear the other. Which shall prevail is determined by circumstances. In the one case we see superstition and slavery; in the other, religious and political lawlessness. The human race has ever oscillated between the two. Yet there cannot be a stronger testimony that man is made to be ruled over as well as to rule, than the great fact that no body of men can cast off the ordinances of God without fashioning others of their own.

The Church, therefore, has to maintain each of these two principles in men, without impairing or abolishing the other.

We do not say that all men love to be priest-ridden; but we see from the above, why it is that men, instead of withstanding every attempt at ecclesiastical domination, so often gladly allow it. We see it alike in the benighted heathen and in the civilized Christian—in the discipline of Rome, pleading divine right, and in the discipline of the conventicle, based on personal favour. And we see that a people who have long contemned, as unspiritual bondage, the ordinances of the Church, do, when brought to feel their value, so cast themselves prostrate before them, unduly extend their sphere, and carry them into the veriest trifles, as to expose at once their own souls to danger, and those ordinances themselves to ridicule.

On the other hand, there have been crises in the history of the Church, when the tyranny exercised in Christ's name, and the abominations which claimed the sanction of His authority, have led ecclesiastical reformers to regard spiritual lawlessness as the most perfect form of Gospel liberty, and to confound deliverance from those things which impede our

full obedience to the laws of Christ's house with deliverance from the obligation of those laws themselves. And there have been, yea, now are, many religious bodies who, while they would shudder at the idea of hailing Christ as the emancipator of the lusts of men, really prepare men's hearts for doing so, by hailing Him as the liberator of men from the yoke of all rule in Church and State—as the great destroyer of His own institutions, the great abolitionist of shams, the great socialist of humanity.

One of the first things to be done in commending the offices of the Church to men, is to avow the evil which their abuse has done. Because they are, when rightly used, the best of all things, they are, when used amiss, the worst. If the work of redemption infers no annihilation of any part of man's being, no destruction of his integrity, and no oppression of his functions, but, on the contrary, is intended to ennoble them all, then the action of ecclesiastical appliances upon men should not obliterate their personal responsibility, or detrude them from their proper place, but develop their personal dignity and fit them for their place. In other words, the Church is set, not to do men's duties for them, but to teach them those duties, and to impart to them all grace necessary for the fulfilment of the same. Against this definition of her duty, however, the Church has always been tempted to offend. It is true that all Christendom teems with examples of usurpation by the civil power over the Church; so that even unchangeable Rome herself, who, with all her faults, has the merit of seeing and protesting against the evil of civil usurpation, has, in every Roman Catholic country, nevertheless yielded to necessity. And were we now addressing the State, we should tell it how, in absorbing the Church, and subjecting her spiritual functions to the laws of this world, it is not only disowning her as the mystery of the coming Kingdom, but so effectually disabling her from ministering a full blessing to the body politic, that the State thus injures itself by its own injustice. But while an instinctive consciousness makes the ruler of each land claim dominion over everything belonging thereto and found therein, that very consciousness of the Church, that she is of higher origin, constitution, and destiny than an earthly kingdom, which should keep her apart from the world, often tempts her to aspire to the present regulation of its affairs. Here, also, the antagonism is a divine appointment; but its abuse is a human error. The two powers which, having in them nothing homogeneous, ought never to con-

flict, come, by the ignorance or misplaced ambition of those who wield them, into destructive collision or deadening confusion. It is no blasphemy to believe both in God and in the king; for the king is God's minister. But it is fatal to the Church to believe in the king, as if in a pope over, or a priest in, the house of God. The Church and the State ought never to be mingled, else the Church will assuredly go to the wall. But they ought never to be severed, else the State will be a prey to Satan. If the Church takes too high a place, we have priestcraft; if too low, we have statecraft. In either case the Church loses her power to bless. It is hard to say whether the domination or the servility of a hierarchy is the worse. On the one hand, of all the direful descents which the Church ever made from Heaven to earth, that was perhaps the worst, when, being advanced to honour for her utility to society, she aspired to assume the reins of the State, and, by competing for rank and authority in the world, proclaimed and sought her own degradation. On the other, who can remember without sorrow and disgust how, six years ago, the Romish dignitary alternately consecrated sceptres and trees of liberty, and the Protestant minister, who one week delivered flattering orations to royalty, the next immortalized the memory of martyred democrats? When the two administrations of the State and the Church are woven as warp and woof into one web, what comes of it but that garment of linen and woollen which Scripture forbids? Where, within the whole range of Romish lands, is greater violence done to the sacredness of religion and the tenderness of conscience, than in Protestant lands, where the State baptizes children, makes the Lord's Supper the condition of apprenticeship, makes ecclesiastical confession a forced ingredient in the sentence of the most impenitent criminal on pain of further punishment, and punishes with death the clergy who break the seal of confession? and where those social distinctions, which God sacredly upholds, and which may never, on the plea of Christian equality, be obliterated, are contentiously asserted in the house of God, in which ecclesiastical distinctions alone should be observed?

Whether openly or by stealth—whether the vicegerent of Christ has claimed the neck of kings, or the priest, like the spider, has craftily woven his web in their palaces,—any endeavour by the minister of Christ to supplant men in their places, is an act of treachery, both against the men whom he should assist to please God in those places, and against Christ, who gave him mission to help them. The king,

as supreme, has power over all persons in the things of this world; and, as men living in this world, the ministers of Christ are as much his lieges as any other men. On the other hand, a member of Christ who is by the providence of God a king, although he does not hold his throne of any ecclesiastic, is bound to rule according to the laws of God; and the ministers of Christ are bound to teach him all those laws, especially such as bear upon his duties. But while they instruct him, they may not virtually depose him by prescribing how he shall act. On him lies the burden of digesting, adopting, and assimilating into his own being the truth of God. Having so done, he is the judge how to apply to existing circumstances that which he has learned. The function of the Church is over. And if he needs advice how to act in his kingdom, his proper advisers are not ecclesiastics, but laymen who fear God. It is the part of the ecclesiastic to see that the king is a holy man, and well instructed in the truth; but he goes beyond his province if he follow the king into his council of state, and judge as to his political acts. The same fidelity to God which should bow the king to spiritual *counsel*, should arm his resistance against spiritual *interference*.

And as with the State, so with the Family. No Church makes a king, a husband, or a father. A baptized husband or father is a child of the Church; but, as a husband or father, he represents God. As a member of Christ, he is blessed of Christ's minister; but as a husband or father, he is the blesser, not the blessed. He should, indeed, ever welcome to his house the minister of Christ, and facilitate in every way his ministration to its individual members. And if the head of a house, under pretext of vindicating his place against priestcraft, bids away the minister of Christ, he is in great danger of bidding away Christ Himself, and provoking God to leave his house uncleansed. To him, and not to any priest, does it pertain to bless his household, and to offer up their worship to God. And if no other layman has any right to usurp his duties on the plea of zeal for God, no minister of Christ has, on the plea of any divine commission. God made fathers as well as ministers. He will guard the integrity of the one as jealously as the usefulness of the other. He will never expunge the one to magnify the blessing which the other shall bring. He is a God of order. He honours all the works of His hands. The king and the husband who receive anointing and blessing at the hand of Christ's minister, receive elevation of standing and increase of grace.

And no man who fears God would go without such sacred offices. But their rights are independent of either. And that error by which the Anglican Church makes the validity of marriage to depend on an ecclesiastical ceremony, is precisely like that which derives the title to reign from Papal authority.

Let us not think that this error is confined to certain sections of the Church. In some parts of the Church the false doctrine may be openly avowed. But it is acted upon in all. We may stand indignant at the magnitude of Papal usurpation, and abhor the wickedness of Jesuit intrigue. But no devotee ever kissed the toe of Peter's successor with blinder servility, or more entirely abdicated his manhood and conscience before the word of a spiritual adviser, than the spell-bound admirer of some Evangelical preacher. And we doubt if the most snake-like insinuation of the most artful son of the Propaganda into family privacy, or his subversion of domestic authority and severance of domestic ties, on the plea of religion, might not find abundant parallels at the very antipodes of Rome—in the conduct of Gospel ministers, who walk and talk like the purest of the pure. A meddling Church may *gain converts*. But it *destroys men*. Within her due sphere of action, the Church is the salt of the earth. But mistaking her proper border, intruding where she should not, she is the mother of confusion, hypocrisy, and strife, whether in Edinburgh or in Rome.

We justly exclaim in indignation at the cruelty, and in wonder at the unsound principles, exhibited in the handing over of heretics by Rome to the civil power. The desire in the Church to hand them over to some one is right. She should be able to deliver them to Satan, as Paul did. But her delivery of them to the magistrate is the resort of a Church sunk into the flesh, devoid of spiritual power, and content with fleshly sanctions. Is there no delivery to the civil power among us now? We cannot get heretics and schismatics burned; but we can make them smart, in their worldly interests, for their opposition to us. To insist that our servants, our tradesmen, our doctor, our lawyer, shall belong to our connexion, as a Methodist would say; or to dismiss those who do not from our service, and withdraw from them our custom, is as essentially Popish as anything in Rome, and the act of those who would have an *auto-da-fé* if they dared. The recommendation of a tailor is, that he makes a good coat, not that he is Established or Free Kirk. If you dismiss a good tailor on any such ground, you gratify your

bigotry by committing positive injustice. Those theological antipathies which, in this Protestant land, under the prostituted name of zeal for God, poison the issues and sour the amenities of life, are much more the zeal of the Satanic accuser and relentless persecutors than that of the faithful shepherd or the humble martyr. And they who separate spouses for religion's sake, whether dominant Rome or German Baptists, convert the Gospel of grace into a truculent Moloch. The doctrine that the end sanctifies the means, is not confined to Rome. Ecclesiastics are proverbially the worst men of business, and form the most unjust tribunals, because they leap to their objects in disregard of human obligations and social relations. The more the Church confines herself to her proper duties, the more effectually will she discharge them. In doing otherwise, she at once dissipates her strength, forfeits her own proper grace, violates the work of grace in all around her. The man who minds the business of others is proverbially sure to neglect his own, and be the pest of his neighbourhood. In that measure in which the Church *meddles* she is unable to *work*. Made the keeper of the vineyards, she does not keep her own, and thus merits the anger of her mother's children. (Song i. 6.) Now, how do the facts stand? How has the Church corrected the evil and fostered the good?

Though the Church should not wield the sceptre of earthly rule, she should teach those who do. There was a time when, in this respect, she did her duty. It is vain for the Church to assert her own independence against the powers that be, if she neglect that in which the use of her independence lies—the instruction of all men. The same consciousness of her divine standing, which made her ancient prelates bold to debar, at once literally and symbolically, the Roman Emperor, as a layman, from the seat of priesthood, once filled her ministers with loving fidelity in admonishing the great of the earth. God then stood among the gods. And they whom Bacon calls “mortal gods,” heard words of truth, which told through them upon their whole dominions, from the lips of men who, in the fear of God, feared not the face of man. But how is it now? These “mortal gods” hear no true word from the Immortal. With the heaviest responsibility, they receive least aid. With the greatest temptations to follow their own lusts, they receive the least help to mortify them, the most politely feeble instructions as to the will of

God. Bereft of friends, compassed about with flatterers and parasites, they hear much as to the duties of their subjects, but little as to their own. The ministers of Christ seek to bask in the sunshine of royal favour, by making the Word of God not the guide, but the anodyne of the royal conscience. They eat the fat, and clothe themselves with the fleece, and leave the rams of the flock to wander and lead the flock astray. Alas! in what hypocrisy do they cry out against the ungodliness of European politics and courts, while they themselves, enjoying the advancement of Daniel, have withheld his testimony; ready to echo servilely, this day, the voice of a tyrant, and the next, the voice of a mob; and to sell the sanction of religion to the best purchaser! What substitute for this great, legitimate, and comprehensive work of the clergy, in teaching kings righteousness, can be found in the contentious protests of forward zealots, in the triumphant and disloyal taunts of Satanic accusers, or even in the silent prayers of single mourners in Zion? The governors of Europe see the handwriting on the wall, and quake. But if the right expounders be silent, shall not the wisdom of the statesman be vain to avert the judgment; and shall not the blood of the slain lie at the door of the faithless watchman?

Moreover, if it be so with the prince, how stands it with the people? In some lands, we see the course of this world's affairs impeded by religious observances, which do little to prepare men for the world to come. We see a priesthood abolishing instead of expressing the royal priesthood of all saints—rites, superstitious because meaningless—laws enforced by those who confiscate the statute-book of God's kingdom—discipline, submission to which is the excuse for sin—the invocation of those who cannot help, instead of Him who can—and the vain oblation of man's righteousness, instead of the reception of God's; in short, man met by every religious appliance, and yet left as he was. In other parts, we behold the lax dereliction of truth under the mask of indignation at error—the rejection of food and medicine from fear of poison—the transformation of heathen *doctrines* into infidel blasphemies by the very men who would reject heathen *rites* in a Christian garb—the removal of every Christian landmark—the pulling down of every Christian structure—the transmutation of Christians into the world, and, as its necessary consequence, the transmutation of Christianity into a world religion; in short, the gospel of the last, not the Papal, Antichrist.

In others, we see the child of hope overlaid by Acts of Parliament and Cabinet orders, the citizens of the heavenly city enrolled among the citizens of the State, and its ministers degraded to be a branch of secular police. In others, we behold the body of Christ robbed of those joints and bands by which its nourishment should be ministered from the Head, and etherealized into a lawless and amorphous aggregate of pious souls; who, while they religiously eschew, as carnal and quenching to the Spirit, all laws of Christ, all divine ordinances of worship, all divinely-regulated action, vaunt their A B C of doctrine without learning to read, and imperil the foundation by neglecting the superstructure—who erect arbitrary tests of holiness, the offspring of narrowness and the parents of Pharisaism; who violate social relations on the plea of superior sainthood, and, in direct contradiction to the epistles of the Apostles, level all social ranks on the plea of Christian brotherhood; men who extinguish their Christian life by the bustle of occupations exceeding their faith; who weary the world and themselves by labours which God never commanded and prayers which God never will answer, and compensate by mutual flatteries for the withheld approbation of God; who sow the seed in contempt of every divine appointment for nourishing the plant; who strive to keep down the weeds by human inventions, after having thrown from their hand every implement of God; and who labour after their own fashion to establish the kingdom of God, without understanding how God will establish that kingdom, or wherein it should consist.

Alas! how idle, yea, more than idle, it is to heave pious sighs over the waywardness of God's children, when they are not reminded that they are His children, and, as such, corrected; or to apply to man's own poor devices for correction, while every machinery is refused as Popish by which God, the only corrector, would correct! How shall the Church, as the servant of God, prosper, when all her members leave their relative duties undone? Or how shall the house of God ever be ready to welcome its Master if the households which compose it live in the breach of His heavenly order?

But if the evil has not been corrected, as little has the good been fostered. We have already shown that Christianity, although it mortifies the carnal, yet in no department abolishes the natural. Did it do so, it would condemn not only the destructive works of Satan, but the original work

of God. Man has, indeed, spiritual wants and desires in the Church to which he is else a stranger; but he has also natural desires implanted in him from the beginning, which, although disturbed and misdirected by Satan, are in themselves good, and should be fulfilled by that divine machinery which shall supply the whole desiderata of the universe.

How, then, has the Church met these two classes of requirements? In that great ecclesiastical system which has been well described as the masterpiece of God, of man, and of Satan, we see indeed a machinery for the satisfying of all men's desires to an extent which we look for in vain among those who are beyond its pale, save in the Oriental Churches, which never were within it, and never learned from it, but which have retained from primitive times, in common with it, many institutions which Protestants have lost, and which, in our insular ignorance, we are too much accustomed to brand as Popish. But although we find the machinery there, and although some have used it to the good of the Church, we miss, on the whole, the right spirit in which that machinery should be used. Hence the machinery has become grievously corrupted, and the sins which should have been extirpated have been fostered. On the other hand, of the Protestant Churches, some indeed followed the wise counsel of Luther, to retain all that was not plainly contrary to Scripture, in preference to the rash counsel of Calvin, to reject all which could not be proved therefrom. In so doing, they recorded their faith that the Church, though corrupt, was still the temple of the Holy Ghost, the depositary of God's truth, and the theatre on which we should expect to see His operation; and they avoided the great danger of arrogating to themselves the power to construct, *de novo*, out of a written book, and according to the judgment of each who consulted it, a new ecclesiastical system which should own no parentage in any prior system, which should ignore the Church for fourteen centuries, and claim exclusive guidance by the Spirit of God in the invention of truth. There are, indeed, in the Protestant Churches men who, self-satisfied, prejudiced, content to live without progress, and taught the ruinous lesson of limiting their spiritual demands by the supply, praise the means of grace which they possess as adequate, and, in almost incredible hallucination, boast themselves as witnesses for the *whole truth* of God! Yet at all times of searching and trial, and in all persons who have either personal holiness, or the progress of the Church to her consummation, deeply at heart, there

is but one feeling—not only that we are, as the Epistle of Christ, far from what we should be in the sight of God or man, and that many precious passages of that Epistle have been blotted out among us, but that the Church among Protestants has neither the fit understanding of her children's wants, nor the fit means for their supply; that she is neither duly armed against the assaults of the enemy, nor duly prepared to stand before her Lord; and that, in our present scattered and unfurnished condition, we are utterly unable to lay full hold on that salvation to which we are called in one body. If we knew the pangs of spiritual hunger and thirst, the agony of a conscience which cannot get rid of its burden, the perplexity of those who seek guidance in vain, the fanatical extravagances of those whom a right sphere of operation would have healthfully occupied, and the ruin of those whom their spiritual mother has failed to uphold or restore,—we should wonder less at men turning to every quarter for a ray of hope, and be more lenient to them than to those who are too selfishly at ease to have such wants, or take trouble to meet them. Sects there were indeed before the Reformation. The charge of the Papist, that they took their origin in it, is false. In the eye of God, who is not deceived by make-believes, there have been sects enough in Rome; and perhaps those schisms which are not pronounced in open separation are ultimately more ruinous than those that are. But almost all sects, ancient or modern, have been formed, not only by pious persons, but by persons perhaps the most pious of their time, who, lacking the grace of patience, and making of their own conscience an idol before which all other things are made to bow, have preferred their own pleasure to the good of the Church. Almost all sects have originated in the assertion of some neglected truth, which, loved by them the more on that account, has assumed in their hands an exaggerated, and, for want of due balance, soon a perverted form. Almost all have been the refuges of faithful men, who had demanded reform in vain, and found no sympathy for their real wants. For one case in which a sect has embodied a lie, there are fifty in which it has embodied the truth. Hence, although the Church is the pillar and ground of the truth, yet truth and right have been as often with the condemned as with their condemners; because those condemners, imagining that the whole compass of truth lay with them, have refused to hear voices from other parts of the Church, which, although grating to their partial ears, were part of the divine dia-

pason. Without extenuating the guilt of schism, we should better employ ourselves in confessing before God those sins of the Church which became, through the impatience of those aggrieved by them, the excuses of schism, than in uttering anathemas on that child of our own unfaithfulness to the catholic deposit of truth. The Reformers may have erred; but they were the children of Rome, whom she provoked to wrath. If they did right, she has the praise of begetting those who could do right. If wrong, she has the blame of so neglecting them that they fell away. Schism is not mere sin. It is also a divine judgment on sin. To descend to later times, and come nearer home. What but the coldness of the National Church gave birth to the "Readers" of Sweden? What but the dead and heretical philosophy of Lutheranism gave birth to the Moravians of Germany? What but the fatalist severity of Calvinism has cut off so many, who have cut off others in turn, mistaking schismatic pride for the safeguard of purity? Do not our home missions, in proclaiming our zeal, also proclaim with trumpet voice the desolations of the Lord's vineyard? Was it not the time-serving and lukewarmness of the Kirk that generated the chief schisms in our native land? Was it not the selfishness of the snug rectory, and the supercilious gentility of the parson, around whom his neglected parishioners had grown up in all but heathen ignorance and vice, that caused Methodism to spread like wild-fire in England? It throve, because the people at large cried out for the pure Gospel, and for the cure of souls elsewhere withheld. And the bugbear of schism, held up by the hands of hirelings, could not frighten men from it. Men were in earnest, because they were in need; and necessity had no law. Nothing but a craving for pastoral care, which brooked no refusal, could have reconciled Protestants and Englishmen to the more than Papal yoke of inquisitorial strictness and unnatural regulation which Methodism, if administered to the letter, would present. Is it not because the name of the Lord is not published, that our chief religion lies in praising the names of men? Is it not because the shepherds have a hireling's heart, that the sheep of God's pasture seek to every religious quack, or hug their own sorrows in solitary silence, rather than resort to the minister of Christ? Is it not the refusal of the Church to seek of God supernatural gifts, as earnest of the glory to be revealed—wherewith to alleviate the ills of humanity, and to gratify the inherent and just desire of man in all

ages for supernatural light—that has led many earnest persons to sacrifice their manhood on the altar of Mesmerism, and to unite with the idle and profane in inviting spirits that peep and mutter to their tea-tables? Is it not the refusal of the Church to flee out of Babylon in the true sense of the word (not by adding, in censorious and reckless self-will, one more to her streets and one more to her discordant tongues; but by coming out of human confusion into divine order, out of the captivity of death into the liberty of life, out of bondage to the world into obedience to Christ)—is it not this her refusal, as the bride, to prepare for the Bridegroom, who now puts on Him again the apparel of His restored ordinances, and waits to put on her the ornaments of His long obsolete gifts—is it not her refusal to be led into the land of promise, as by Moses and Aaron, and to yield those who shall be the first-fruits to God and to the Lamb, that has left room for the coarse delusions of Johanna Southcote, or the baseless visions of Swedenborg, and is now hurrying away hundreds and thousands of this and other countries into those bands of Mormonite blasphemy who seek in the new continent the world to come? Is it not because the Church has robbed her children of meat and drink, that they devour bread of falsehood, and quaff wine of delusion? Has not our spiritual death made popular galvanic resuscitation at the hands of Satan? Is it not because no voice from the sanctuary interprets events to come, or shows them the true burden and deliverance of God, that despair drives them to soothsayers of every kind? Finally, is it not the refusal of the Church to hasten the coming of the Lord—when the curse shall be removed and the oppressor shall cease—that is crowding the ranks of revolution and socialism, and casting men by millions into the arms of that last Antichrist, who shall seduce the Churches as Absalom did the wives of David, and seek to bear away from the true Christ the palm of universal philanthropy, effectual redress, and eternal reformation?

Having taken a rapid survey of the chief particulars in which the Church has failed to be profitable unto men, let us now consider that which is necessary to her being profitable again.

This may, of course, be expressed in one word, that she quench not the Spirit, and yield herself to be the fit instrument of Christ. The Holy Spirit, who fulfils by men on earth the offices of Christ in obedience to His laws of ac-

tion, would ever fulfil, in and by the Church, all the good pleasure of His goodness, and the work of faith with power. By removing the hindrances to His working, and yielding ourselves as His well-prepared instruments—not by stirring up our own flesh, do we become fellow-workers with God.

Yet a general rule of this kind leaves the practical question unanswered; and, if substituted for a practical answer, is little better than that idle cant which they who hinder God know well how to employ. The question is: What, in our existing circumstances, will give free scope to the operation of Christ; and what operation of Christ have we to expect?

I. The first requirement is, that the Church shall act as one; and, while the division of the Church continues, that they who profess to serve God and men shall live in the constant faith that the Church is essentially one, in the constant abhorrence of schism, and in the constant endeavour to restore her to her proper unity; so that God, who sees the hearts, shall regard and bless them, as representing unity and not division.

Our Lord, in His great intercessory prayer, first for His disciples, and then for all who should believe on Him through their word, desired that they might be one in Him and in His Father, in order that the world might believe that the Father had sent Him. This wonderful unity, “one as We are”—“I in them, and Thou in Me,” He associates with their being “perfect in one,” and beholding His resurrection glory (John xvii. 20, &c). In the days of His humility He was, indeed, the only-begotten Son of God. But His eternal glory He had laid aside at His incarnation; and He did not receive it again till, as man, He was perfected and for the first time invested with it, at His resurrection. He did, indeed, on the Mount of Transfiguration, foreshow it, to the comfort of His disciples; but He shall not be permanently seen in it till He shall come again from the right hand of God. Then, when He, with the called, the chosen, and the faithful, shall reign on the earth, shall our perfection come; and, therefore, not till then shall our unity in Him be fulfilled and revealed. It is now a mystery, even as the whole Church is a mystery of good things to come. Yet we are *now* one in Him. And in so far as the Church, although a mystery, is visibly exhibited in her sacraments and ministers, in so far should she appear as a unity. Hidden occasionally she may be, in point of fact; but to be hidden is not the proper attribute of the city set on a hill.

Invisible believers there may be, but an essentially invisible Church is such a contradiction in terms, that it were amazing how sensible men can let themselves be put off by such a meaningless phrase, were it not that the theory is adopted as an escape from acknowledging the sin of the visible Church, by idolizing the dream of a holy invisible Church. If the Church is, and should be, visible, she should never be seen save as one. Christ is one, and we, being many, are one Christ. God, the head of Christ, is one. The Church, His body, is also one. A head with many members one can understand, but a head with many bodies is a monster, deserving not of honour, but of death. Nowhere in all Scripture do we read of one shepherd and many folds. Where many folds claim one shepherd, the case is as contrary to Christian truth as where many wives claim one husband. The Church may worship in many places; but many Churches are a lie against the unity of God. He who is the Truth may teach it in two different manners, for He can illustrate it by all creation. He may also adapt it to two different persons, for He knoweth all His handiworks. But He cannot teach two opposite doctrines; our heavenly Law-giver cannot have two different codes; our High Priest cannot present as from us two opposite classes of oblations.

No doubt the unity of the Church in Christ the Head is a much deeper thing than mere agreement, either in word or in action; and our assurance in that unity is a far higher joy than the mere mutual satisfaction of those who think alike, in one another. Union in sentiment and in action may or may not be signs of unity, but they never can of themselves constitute unity; and they are no true signs of it, unless they spring from unity of being, and continually recognize it as their basis. God is not only the object of our worship, and the Master whom we serve, but the author of our new being in Christ. Our unity in Christ is an essential unity of life. It is constituted by no compact or sympathy of man, but by an act of God in holy baptism, whereby, as our Confession saith, we are grafted into Christ. And it is not divorced by our unworthy strifes as God's children, until the Heavenly Father, who alone can, shall cast the offenders out of the family. This unity is not seen, like the shallow unities of man, in mere external and slavish uniformity. The Church is the theatre for the display of God's manifold wisdom. He who binds up the diverse members into one natural body, under one life-giving and guardian head—He who exhibits all the varieties and grades of the body

politic under one government—He who combines many notes into one diapason, and many letters into one glorious name, is the same who combines into one body many diverse members, bound by joints and bands unto one Head, and to each other, and from that Head receiving divers supplies of one grace. All sides of Christian manhood, or Christian doctrine, can no more be alike than all bodily members or notes of music. Such uniformity would be the symbol, not of God's glorious variety, but of man's narrow stereotype. Nevertheless, discord can no more be a part of harmony or melody, than falsehood one aspect of truth, or hatred a phase of love; and to babble in bastard and mawkish charity about Christian unity among those who differ in all those things by which that unity can express itself, is either to deny all reality in moral distinctions, and reduce everything to opinion, or to insult common sense in attempting to exonerate ourselves from the guilt of having parted Christ's raiment among us, and cast lots for His vesture. Agreeing to differ is the most false of all positions; acting on compromise is the most impossible of all problems; co-operation by those who differ as to the principles of operation, may make a fair show, but inevitably does something else than the thing intended, and leaves *that* undone. These are no impracticable theories. The matter comes practically home to every daily transaction, to every religious duty, to every parish and every house in our land. If we are to pray for our children, or instruct and admonish them, we must know what they are. If we cannot plead and labour in the same way for our own children and those of others, we cannot plead and labour in the same way for those who are God's children and those who are not. That which suited all alike would be worthless for any. How can he who regards all the baptized as God's children, rebellious or obedient, and he who does not, hold one language to them, or treat them in one way? How can I effectually address myself to the real circumstances of a sinner, if I do not know whether he is still out of covenant with God, or a breaker of God's covenant in holy baptism? How can the body of Christ be brought to perfection, if its members are fed with no more than is meted out to the heathen? Will they rather not *be* as we treat them? And how can he who regards the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as indeed the communion of Christ's body and blood, and he who does not, hold the same language in either exhorting the faithful or rebuking the faithless communicant? It is this confounding of all things

that differ, that empties all words of their power, and reduces them to conventional religious slang. It is this that reduces to a useless minimum that residue of truth on which all agreed; it is this that establishes the fabric of society upon hollow compromises, which skin over the sore and leave the gangrene below, which raise edifices fair but rotten, and build bulwarks of pasteboard against the enemy. Would you have a gauge by which to measure the curse, not causeless, which dogs us at every step in the progress of ecclesiastical schism? You need look no further than to all those social questions which are complicated instead of being cleared by our present Christianity. If the Church were one in each land, and in all, they would present no difficulties whatever; but while she is divided, they are, and must be, incapable of any solution but that of force; and they are only aggravated by the attempts of theorists who, instead of suffering tacit adjustment to mitigate evils which it cannot cure, raise questions which they cannot solve, and disturb minds which they cannot quiet. The question of national education, lately mooted among us, can, while our schisms last, never cease to steer between the Scylla of conflicting creeds and the Charybdis of infidel neutrality. Combine the heterogeneous elements as skilfully as you may, you never can keep them together but by holding in abeyance the irreconcilable principles in which they originate. So long as the Church is rent by schism, education must either be sacrificed to the idol of conscience, or flourish on the ruins both of conscience and of religion. Till the Church is again one, our only peace is to let well alone.

If the Church is one, her unity should express itself in the essentials of her constitution, in the articles of her faith, in the whole scheme of her worship, and in her testimony towards the world. But we must be on our guard against a false unity.

As every circle has not only a circumference but a centre, so does the unity of the Church require, not only that she shall be visibly marked off from the world, but that she shall gravitate round a visible central authority. If she, indeed, were wholly inorganic, her state would indeed be at variance with the analogy of all God's works, animal, vegetable, or even mineral, and would, in the highest of all provinces, justify, in every other province, chaos against order. Yet it would excuse the wild idea of a unity, maintained by invisible means between an invisible Church and an invisible Head. The Lord Jesus is indeed the only centre, as He is the only

Head of the Church. All earthly centres or heads which obscure Him are abominations. If a centre legitimately exists, it is to point to Him, and exhibit Him. Yet He is the sole centre in no other sense than that in which He is the sole teacher and comforter of His Church. If His exclusive office as teacher and comforter does not exclude earthly teachers and comforters, neither does His exclusive place as the centre of authority exclude a visible centre of authority. There are, indeed, those who would abolish all teaching by men, and ground their views on the express description of the new covenant in the Epistle to the Hebrews. We need not here do more than remark that the thing which should cease under the new covenant, is not the teaching of those who *do know* God, but the teaching of men to *know* Him; for this simple reason, that all who are the children of God by baptism are presumed to know God, and because they know Him, are taught what others cannot learn; and that the knowledge of God and assurance towards Him is the starting-point, and not the goal, of the Christian's life. But if all the clergy will carry out the godless doctrine of these days, that every craft is a sham, and that as every man should be his own doctor and his own lawyer, so every man should be his own minister; if they will abdicate their places, and renounce their stipends; and if every one of the laity will close his lips and ears and heart against every word or act of Christian comfort to or from a Christian brother,—they may then be listened to in pleading against a visible authority in the Church on earth; but assuredly not till then. If Christ is all in all, and His effectual working shows itself in the measure of every part, He who condescends to *teach* by men, also condescends by them to *rule*. If His functions are communicable in the one case, they are so in the other also.

Still, they who acknowledge the deputation of Christ's rule to men, may deny the right of any central authority. This denial, however, evidently rests on the same principle as the denial of any authority whatever; for, if all Christ's ministers insist for His separate guidance, all His people may do the same; and it is expressly contradicted by the facts. If there ever was a centre of unity appointed by God in the Christian Church, that fact affords the very strongest presumption that the existence of a visible centre is the permanent way of God. Yet, even throwing this presumption aside, the fact that God once did, in the Christian

Church, expressly appoint a visible centre of unity, is positive proof that such a visible centre is not in itself unlawful, far less blasphemous. Now the Apostles were at the first that visible centre of unity. In other words, the Church sought and found in the Apostles the guidance and help of Christ, and forsook it in forsaking their doctrine and fellowship. Indeed, John, in his epistle, speaks of the fellowship of the saints with God as their participation in a fellowship which the Apostles already enjoyed. And it is not to be conceived that on their decease, God willed to preserve the blessing of a visible centre in every diocese, and leave the universal Church destitute of the same. What was good or bad for the part, must have been still better or still worse for the whole. Indeed, its absence from the whole must have soon been followed by its loss to each part. Hence we find that the Church has never renounced her faith in a visible centre of unity and government. The Bishops, next in office to the Apostles, assumed—nay, we believe, providentially and provisionally received from God—while the highest ordinance of Apostles was absent, not only the care each of his own diocese, but the care of the Church Universal; and their synods and councils formed, as a *succedaneum* for a better, because more scriptural, centre, the visible centre for the whole body. But this centre was never thoroughly felt to be the right one even in theory; and in practice it was found to disappoint the desires of the faithful for adequate guidance in the one way of truth. Hence the rise of the Romish supremacy on the ruins of this unwieldy machinery—an event which showed the victory of universal spiritual instinct over episcopal jealousy. But the claims of the Pope, although they promised a better fulfilment of the Church's desires, were, and are, essentially unscriptural; and the Oriental Churches have never recognized them. Therefore, to make the test of Catholic unity adherence to the Papal chair, must generate a schismatic spirit in those who adopt it. The fact is, that those in this land who make such an outcry against the Papacy do not go far enough; they nibble at its mere fruits, instead of biting at its root; and they cannot do otherwise, because they are not themselves in the position, or possessed of the truth, which should enable them to do so. None but they who have a better thing, are armed, either to resist the fascinations, or to overthrow the errors of the Papacy. But what have been the substitutes for this Papal unity among the Churches of the Reformation? They could no longer have any universal centre. The majority fell into the

arms of the temporal rulers over those territories in which they were found. The kings of Christendom presumed, or were invited, to intrude into, and thus desecrate an office wholly spiritual; and in so doing, they put the seal on schism, by making the nation and the Church co-extensive, and creating many separate Churches with many separate heads. To those who reflect on the unscriptural position of both the Pope and the King, it must be a puzzling question where else to find a visible unity; and they never will find it till it please the Lord to move their hearts to acknowledge Apostles again. But, in the meantime, all nature and all social events continue their constant testimony for a visible centre of unity, not only future, in the person of the returning Lord, but present, in those of His proper ministers. There never was a club without its central board; there never was a sect without a centre of operation. No central power was ever overthrown without an immediate endeavour to raise up another. And shall all this indicate nothing as to the way of God in His Church, for which He has especial care, and from which all men and institutions should learn?

The radical error in men's ideas of unity is, that they regard it as proceeding from those to be united, instead of from Him in whom they are united. We do, indeed, grow up into our Head; but we do so by that which proceeds from Him. As God is the fountain of life, so is Christ the fountain of unity; and the joints and bands, by which the body is held together and its divine nourishment administered, are as needful as the head to the growth of the body. Apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors are the channels by which Christ causes the life to flow down. If it comes from Him, it should come by them.

But the Papal unity is not the only false one. We may look nearer home. The Pope enjoins all men to return to their Roman obedience, because he claims to be the head of all. In this he is, at least, consistent. But where no such claim is preferred, a demand by one sect that all shall return to unity by copying it, is as extravagant as the demand that the whole human body shall become one member. Yet this is the moving principle, not only of all Protestant movements against Rome, which have no higher end than to make Romanists Protestants, but also of the contests of Protestants against each other. If unity is to come, it must come as a blessed boon from God; and if from Him, it will not take up the cause of any party in the Church. Drought has chapped the earth; the decay of life

has made the body a prey to diseases and injuries which it might else have withstood; the rending, not the distinction, of the members has marred the body; the ebb-tide has barred the entrance to the haven with rocks and quicksands. He who waters the earth again will not favour one section only of its divided surface. He who revives the life will show it in all the body. He who gives the flood-tide of the full assurance of faith will submerge beneath it all the hindrances of the feeble, all the dangers of the timorous. And He who has an equal eye of love for all the dry bones of the valley, will prophesy to them all alike, and gather up all who hear into one body, which shall not be the copy of any exaggerated bone, but the veritable image of His Christ. One can conceive no greater vanity and arrogance, than for one ecclesiastical body, flattering itself that it is faultless and full, to go forth, ready to affix, in the caricature of Papal infallibility, its sorry stamp upon that which shall be approved of God at the judgment day. And if any Protestant sect, or the Protestant Churches of this land, shall indulge the dream of solitary perfection apart from the rest of Christendom—or if all Protestants banded together, shall expect that consummation for themselves, in utter disregard of, or in antagonism against, their brethren in the Papal and Oriental Churches,—they will certainly be undeceived by the perishing of their false expectations. The Lord of Hosts knows better how to muster His hosts. He knows no such favourites as these; and they who would be the repairers of the breach, the restorers of paths to dwell in, must learn to carry His eye of equal love over every province of His Christian heritage.

There is, however, a unity yet more false. Such as we have described is aimed at, although not in Christian knowledge, yet in Christian zeal. But there is another, now in the mouths of the apostatizing masses, wholly anti-christian. With its coryphæi, all evil and falsehood are but forms of good and truth; and nothing is sin but the assertion of any distinction between truth and falsehood. They are catholic—not because they hold all truth, but because they reject all, and have lifted themselves above all the obsolete distinctions of darker ages; they have discovered a Christianity as wide as the universe; they speak of the world, and the world heareth them; they embrace the whole family of man in one net; their cyclopædias of devilry claim the title of Catholic series; their organization of pantheistic philanthropy styles itself not only a church

but a catholic union. They are determined that the lie shall be universal, and they wait for a universal ordinance to stamp it true—for some final Mahomet, who, indignant at the narrow-minded strifes of men, shall reduce all differences to a common basis of unity; and, as priest and king, as apostle of deified humanity, shall unite all the scattered elements of humanity under one banner and seal, and avenge the name of Deity alike against Christian, Jewish, and Pagan profanation. If Christians will not wrestle with God, for one fold and one shepherd, they shall soon see, to their terror, the finishing of Satan's mystery.

Furthermore, our Lord assigned as the reason of His prayer for our unity, that the world might know that God had sent Him. It is indeed our scriptural hope, that when the Church shall be glorified at the return of the Lord, the Jew shall acknowledge Him, and shall teach the nations to believe in Him. But the unity for which He prayed was one to be seen in this dispensation, and during His absence from us. If His prayer is to be answered at all, it must be answered in this world. And we cannot doubt that it will be answered, even at the expense of the gathering out and burning of many, who seem to be wheat, yet are but tares. We may, alas! conclude how the unity of the Church would convince the world, by seeing how her divisions have been its stumbling-block. Have not the strifes, godlessness, scepticism, and profligacy of Christians, apparently emancipated from the law only to become the bondsmen of Satan, invested with the character of the most cruel irony all attempts to convert the Jew? save when, as Luther was convinced of the divine origin of Christianity by its surviving the abominations which he witnessed in Rome, a repentant Jew may draw the same argument from Christendom at large. Does not even the Turk look on the Christian as a privileged sceptic and sensualist? Is not the savage, whom contact with saints should purify and ennoble, first infected with the sins and diseases, and then with the hypocrisies of Christians? Is not the avarice, injustice, cruelty, sensuality, and profanity of Christians, in every quarter of the heathen world, a sufficient antidote to all the pleadings of the missionary, an answer against all his highly-coloured reports to those who require to see converts as the *quid pro quo* for guineas, and a bulwark against all the artillery of Exeter Hall? Because of these things, the heaven over us is brass—the seed sown is caught away. God sees our hands full of blood, and will not smell our sacrifices.

Men know us by our fruits, and reject us. And when, in spite of these heaven-high barriers, a poor heathen is brought to Christ the Shepherd, what comes of his search for the fold? Is he not like the weary traveller who, on his arrival, is torn to pieces by emissaries who press the claims of many rival hostelries? Has he not sought rest and found perplexity? What can he think of the invitation to exchange his idols for the true God, and to quit the many devious paths of error for the one way of truth, if he finds those who have urged the invitation swearing each by his own molten image of a system or graven image of a man—contradicting each other in doctrine—imposing conflicting rites—torn by rival interests, and plotting to destroy one another's nets while professing to bring the fish ashore? What can he think, when told that he may not receive the sacred name of Christ, unless he will consent thenceforward to bear along with it on his forehead some nickname of man; that, ere he recites the commandments, he must side with those who divide them in one way, against those who do so in another; that ere he prays to God he must choose between "Father our" and "Our Father;" and that no man may sacrifice to God who will not, at the same time, kiss those calves, of which, in all parties alike, men say, "These be our gods"? What can he think, when he finds the gospel of holiness a broken law among all its believers, but that they either mock his misery, or impose a lie on his credulity? What can he do but turn away in aggravated despair or in unutterable scorn?

The divisions of the Church, however, do not affect those without only. Their evil effects are seen on ourselves. Some, indeed, are so willingly blind to the true character of the Church, so wrapped in false security, and so accustomed to measure religion by the rules of mercantile competition, that they actually hail those schisms which directly frustrate the prayer of Christ, as signs of liberal health, stimuli to exertion, safety-valves against dissensions, and conditions of progress. It is bad enough to regard as a mere misfortune that which is positive sin. But to regard it as a positive blessing is nothing short of infatuation. Then only is the Church in the state which Christ desires, when there is not only one Shepherd, but one fold. The more various the members of the body, the more multiform is the grace of God. But if the members be rent away from each other, what common life can they retain—what corruption can they avoid? If our activity have strife at its root, how can true blessing

be its fruit? If we cannot serve God save by injuring our brother, we had better not serve Him at all. What can prosper with a body which parades another name where that of Christ should stand? What can prosper with churches, distinguished by mutual contradiction and exclusive terms of communion, who measure their own welfare by the ill-fare of rivals—who admit to brotherhood, not those whom God gives to them as brethren by baptism, but those whom they select—and who, being called in one body, seek perfection without the body? If God requires that individuals shall heal their quarrels, ere they dare to approach His altar, how can He accept the religious services of churches who count it fidelity to God to be at strife with one another? How can those churches hope to escape, with Philadelphia, the great day of temptation, who live systematically in the breach of Heaven's first law of brotherly love? If he that hateth his brother is a murderer, are not churches which hate each other murderers too? And if no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him, how can churches that live in mutual estrangement, disavowal, and hostility, retain the life of God? Do they not provoke Him daily to withdraw it? Do they not forfeit the capacity to keep it? If the vessel which contains the precious liquor be broken in pieces, does not each sherd, so far from being able to contain the whole, become incapable of holding even its own proportion, and fit only for the dunghill? Is not contending with brethren the next thing to contending with God? And if we use the heavenly arms put into our hands for suicidal strife, what can God do but disarm us, as He has manifestly done? In one body are we called. And, try as we may to crown schism with success, in one body only can we be perfected. It is, indeed, hard to say which is the greater, the wicked ignorance of those who foster schism as a salutary thing, or the childishness of those who seek to heal schism either by those inventions and schemes of religious busybodies which ignore the organic and essential unity of the baptized, or by the adoption on one side, and relinquishment on the other, of this or that insignificant adiaphoron among the rites of the churches. The most divine exhibition of Christian unity lies in the bearing of one another's burdens, and the confession of our common sins—a thing to which schismatics must be utter strangers. They only who hold the unity and seek the perfection of the body, shall receive the promise, common to all, but forfeited by others. One may at present observe, in every part of the

Church, instinctive efforts after unity and catholicity. What else drives Presbyterians into the Episcopal Church, and Episcopalians back into the Papacy, but the desire to retrace the steps and repair the breaches of schism? Let us see to it, that our instinct takes the right direction—that we neither seek the blessing in vain in the Church of the past, nor seek it amiss in a false Church of the future.

II. Further, if we are one, our speech and action must also be one. Union in action may not prove unity; but unity of being must lead to unity of action. Gold, the symbol of truth, is at once the rarest, and the most universally-diffused, and the most ductile of metals, often mingled but never combined with baser substances. The whole of nature so teems with testimonies to the truth, as to leave no doubt that the Gospel proceeds from Him who is Creator. How much more true must this be of the Church, the new creation! If we believe that men are, by baptism, grafted into Christ, and that the whole body of Christ is the temple of the Spirit of truth, we cannot doubt that, in every part, however diseased and deformed, of that body divine truth and life are to be found, as long as it continues of the body. No rash verdict of censorious spiritual pride can cut any member off. If the damnatory judgment of Protestants really cuts Papists off, that of Papists must also cut Protestants off, whichever side is right. To cut off from the body is the exclusive prerogative of God—yea, not even of the Son, but of the Father. And the clearest evidence that any member deserves excision does not go to prove that that excision itself is accomplished. If this then be so, our duty, in approaching every Christian brother, or body of brethren, is to expect to find truth and life among them. "Love rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth." If we begin by seeking a quarrel with them, and fasten upon their errors, we shall foreclose all mutual recognition. Heady, high-minded and meddling, we may vaunt what we misname our uncompromising fidelity; but in delivering our own souls, we sacrifice the end which we profess to seek. We may show the valour of champions or the severity of executioners, but assuredly not the mercy of saviours. Whereas, if our first desire is, not for the triumph of our own cause, but for the peace of Zion, then, although mere agreement is no true basis of unity, we shall aid the growth of unity by the mutual recognition of good. And we shall do so, not as proudly patronizing those whom we esteem less

advanced than ourselves, but in that true, not affected, humility in which we are content to keep within the limits of our place, and expect to receive as well as to give. These principles admit of application to the successive as well as to the contemporary phases of truth. That is no true reformation which spurns, as mediæval rubbish, the forms which express the abiding mind of the Spirit in the Church, which have been for ages consecrated by the approval of the faithful, and which have ever done service as landmarks to the inquirer, as tests of the heretic and schismatic, or as defences against the infidel. We need only observe, how those who would now tamper with the Apostles' Creed, by professing to preserve the Christian idea, while letting go all Christian facts, wander without compass on an ocean of uncertainty, and are blown about by every blast of error, in order to be warned against exchanging, as they say, an obsolete and alien Semitic Christianity for a more enlightened and national Japhetic creed.

That truth which every age and section of the Church presents, justly accommodates itself to the habits and manners of those among whom it resides. We may not suffer its alloy, we may not covet its extension at the expense of its purity or its depth. But we should expect to see it in various guises, and be prepared both to recognize its unity under them all, and to suit our mode of expressing it to all. If it is the mark of an illiterate rustic, or untravelled citizen, to prefer his own limited sphere, habits, and objects to all others, and to have no capacity for understanding or addressing the condition and feelings of other men, so is it the mark of an uncatholic Christian—of an “idiot,” in the etymological sense of the word—to recognize no truth not expressed in the slang of his own party; to express truth in language which none beyond his own clique can understand; to refuse, as superstitious error, all that exceeds his own measure, and scorn, as worthless, all that does not reach it; to vilipend, in religious mannerism, what *he* does not deem beautiful and important; and, with a dogmatism which always bears proportion to men's ignorance, to thrust upon others his own peculiar forms of thought and speech. It is a sad but instructive spectacle, in traversing the various regions of Christendom, to observe how confident each party is in its being the *élite* of the Church; how unable it is to sympathize with others, to apprehend their excellences or wants, or bear with their defects; and how those who most plume themselves on their pure Christianity, are often the

least enlarged by the Christian grace of catholic charity. We talk of the idolatries and exclusive illiberality of Rome. God forbid that we should learn the hypocritical slang, or absorb the corrupting leaven of false liberality! But never did a Papist more deify the Blessed Virgin than stereotyped Lutherans deify the Lutheran Church as the Queen of Heaven among surrounding concubines. Never did a Papist more superciliously cut off from grace all without his pale, than many high Anglicans and close Dissenters do. All this argues a want of love. The polite of this world suit their address to those whom they address. Should Christian kindness do less? It argues a want of wisdom. If the philosopher studies to put his subject in the most intelligible light, should Christian wisdom do less? It argues want of tact. If the cosmopolite accommodates himself to the manners of the land he visits, should the citizen of the world to come do less? And it argues an ignorance of truth. For assuredly he can have no deep and experimental intimacy with truth who knows it only in one dress, who cannot recognize or express it in any but one form of exhibition, and ignorantly meets with contention what he should hail with joy. He is as mechanical a Christian as the most slavish formalist and devotee. Having words for only one class, he cannot have many sympathies or prayers for others. And if he go forth to heal the moral ills of men, he may not, indeed, like a quack, cheat men with spurious drugs, but he has, like a quack, only one medicine for all forms of disease. Our Lord has set us the example of not breaking the bruised reed or quenching the smoking flax. And His apostles became all things to all men.

As to the action of the Church: It is a great mistake to think, in our morbid hatred of Rome, that all religious works are good to which merit is not ascribed. It is not enough that we render to God the honour of all that we do to please Him. Our works must be *His*. They may, indeed, be still merely our own, even although outwardly in accordance with that which He prescribes. But if they do not accord with that, they are certainly not *His*. The current phraseology of the day betrays how little this is laid to heart. We hear continually of spheres of usefulness, of Christian activity, and of labours which have been owned, or which success has stamped with God's approbation. But bustle may be seen without either faith or obedience. Much may be wrought *for* God which is not wrought *in* God. The zeal may be of God, yet the work of man. And

as to undertakings not according to the will of God, success and blessing are *anything* but synonymous. We read of two great occasions on which the children of Israel did that which was right in their own eyes; once on their way to the land of promise (Deut. xii.), and once in the land, after the death of Joshua, under the Judges. As God's people, we also have not yet reached the land, and yet have lost those ordinances which kept the primitive Church in the doing of that which is right in the eyes of God. In many things we have already done that which was right in our own eyes; and, unless our departure be arrested, we are in danger of doing so yet more. We see by the example of Israel, that the raising up of judges, though raised up of God, afforded no permanent remedy. And we know from the sad history of Christendom, how every revival and reformation has gone down. We need such an appearance of Christ for our help—such a permanent divine machinery filled with His saving presence, as shall clearly show us what are God's works, unite us all in the doing of them according to one law of operation, and enable us to work them all in God; so that not only the sloth, but the lawless activity of the flesh may be put down, and we may not, after all our busy exertion, be met by the question, "Who hath required this at your hands?" God demands of us the heart, but not the licence and disorder of volunteers.

Yet, if checked in irregular efforts for the public good, we must not shrink into ourselves. The objective and subjective have equal claims on our regard. It is only exaggerated occupation with the one that closes our eye to the other. Rightly balanced, they agree. There are men who, perhaps without personal confidence in God, at any rate with hearts not yet chastened by His discipline, can range over all the external things of the Church Universal, and care for the whole, while every part is neglected. But there are others, of scrupulous conscience, before whose contracted vision the condition of the individual soul eclipses every other object connected with the corporate interests, either of the Church at large, or of the body politic. The true *via media* is to keep at once the personal piety of the latter and the public spirit of the former.

III. But if the Church be one, and speak and act as one, she must maintain the integrity of Holy Scripture. I do not now allude to the Papal neglect of Scripture; nor to the destructive criticism of neologians; nor to that undervaluing of the Old Testament as a merely half-inspired and unedify-

ing though curious production, which is to be found in many who rank as Evangelical on the continent of Europe; but to that which is daily practised in our own closets and pulpits. Perhaps there never was a nation who so universally possessed, so sacredly prized, and so diligently perused the sacred canon, as the people of this land, without deep apprehension, consistent exposition, or large embrace of its manifold contents. One is absolutely weary of hearing the assertion, that nothing is to be added to, or taken from, the sacred Scriptures, out of the lips of those who, when they have asserted the purity and entireness of the canon, make so little consistent use of it, and bring so little out of it. This is the more strange, that (in this land especially) the practice—excellent, though now disappearing as obsolete—has prevailed, of reading publicly, every Lord's-day, with a running commentary, considerable portions of the Word. And what makes it more striking still is, that, however the Judaic element of literal austerity may have wrinkled the fair countenance of Christian liberty among us, in no land has Old Testament prophecy, bating the occasional extravagances of its application, been more largely employed to the comfort of the faithful. I do not assume any intentional perversion of Scripture,—of that we have for our warning flagrant enough examples elsewhere; but I speak of that unintentional perversion or obscuration of the true meaning of a text which arises from ignorance or disregard of its context. We all know how ignorant we must remain of a human writer's scope if we seek it in mere detached morsels of his writings, and what gross injustice we may do him by an unwarranted application of them. It is not otherwise with the writings of God; from whom, when known, to learn, man should devote his noblest reasoning powers. Not only every prophecy and every epistle, but the whole Bible, is a unity, forasmuch as the purpose of God in the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world is a unity. If we know and bear in view the whole scope of each prophecy or epistle—if we know and stand in the counsel of God, with all its variety of parts and aspects, we shall be able to read each text aright. Failing in this, we shall miss the right use of the text, and make a running commentary on any section of Scripture a most tiresome and useless exercise. Our reading depends on the eyes with which we read. It is well known how, with equal critical powers and equal honesty of purpose, those of different religious views will produce translations of the Scriptures widely divergent;

and how the one will observe niceties of expression and shades of meaning which wholly escape the other. It is the same with exposition as with translation. To select a text is right ; to discourse without a text may be as fanatical as, in the hope of immediate inspiration, to discourse unprepared. But selection is not separation. If we divorce the text from its context, we cut it off from the source of its power ; and the flower, plucked by its admirer from the stalk, loses both scent and beauty.

At the root of this error lies a certain idolatry of the written Word. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. The completed canon is profitable in furnishing the man of God for every good work. But although the Scriptures are the sacred norm of faith and action for the Church, they are neither a foundation to her, nor interpreters to themselves. The Jews were God's people before they had the law. The Christian Church flourished long ere the canon was fixed. The canon was, indeed, like the manna laid up in the Holiest, an abiding deposit, as distinguished from daily instruction. But it arose itself as a part of that instruction. It came from instructors, and these it did not supersede. Men have, indeed, dared, in their morbid jealousy of ecclesiastic authority, to call the Scriptures, instead of the Church, the temple of the Holy Ghost. But even they who would not venture so to speak, give to them a place which really belongs to the Son, or to the Spirit, or to the Church as the body of Christ ; and, thus vindicating the sacredness of the Holy Scriptures at the expense of things yet more sacred, disturb the order of God. A book is, in itself, incapable of inspiration ; but if the men who wrote it were inspired, it deservedly claims the homage due to inspiration. God no more dwells in a book than He is incarnate in a book ; but, as the sword of the Spirit, the Scriptures are mighty.

There never was a more insane cry than that against the word or act of Christ's ministers, as if it were an addition to the canon, and as if the integrity of Holy Scripture could not be vindicated without gagging the mouths or binding the hands of those whom God sends to expound or fulfil it. If our idolatrous magnifying of the authority of the Scriptures carries us thus far—to reject all living authority, and exclude all light of exposition—we must, if consistent, reject, not only the Pope, but the parish minister ; not only the expository or comforting word of living prophecy, but the expository or comforting word of the living preacher. Surely we do not expect a Bible to stand up and speak or act.

And if some one must interpret it before it can be acted on, and some one must carry it out, the only question is, Who shall do so? It must be either men thereto appointed of God, or men selected by us, or each individual for himself. And surely we can be in no doubt with which of these the grace of God for the right instruction and guiding of His Church in the unity of one body is most likely to be. All may err, even they whom God appoints. But in those whom God appoints the risk of error is least. The ministry and the Bible are not rival candidates for our favour or obedience. Each has its own place, and is sufficient therein. But each is in its place needful to us and to the other; and they are intended to act in harmony; for they cannot conflict save by one exceeding its province; and when they conflict, we may be sure that one has been exaggerated so as to invade the province of the other. The minister is the agent; the Bible is the norm of that agent's work. The agent, disregarding the norm, will err. The norm, usurping the place of the agent, is powerless. Be the idol a Bible, a sermon, a tract, an image, a relic, a pope, or a preacher, no idol can give rain, or speak anything but vanity. The idolatry of texts is as easy and as fruitless as any other. The idolatry destroys the very power and beauty which called it forth. We can never too reverently handle Holy Writ; but we can approach texts as if with the superstitious reverence of a talisman, so as to fail of their obvious meaning, and shrink from applying to them those ordinary laws of exposition which apply to all other words. Hence it is that, employed without due regard to the circumstances of the writer or the receivers, or to the drift of the writing, they figure as prefaces to discourses which much more display the ability of the preacher than develop the mind of God; or else they are invested with a meaning which may be abstractly scriptural, but which their contexts and every law of sound interpretation forbid us to find *in them*. Such discourses may be pious oratory, but they are no true application of the Bible.

The unity of plan in Holy Scripture demands unity of interpretation by the Church. Every legitimate teacher may rely on being enlightened of God in his exposition of the Word. But if any higher ordinance be required for the right and universal guidance of teachers, that ordinance should be in a condition to furnish them with one consistent interpretation of Scripture, which shall, however multiform, rest on invariable principles of truth. God has not furnished us with a ready-made system of theology; but theology—the

science of God—is, if any science is, deserving of being systematized. It is the legitimate province of wisdom, exercised in the obedience of faith, so to do ; and He would ever have those in the Church whose office it is to do so ; delivering, as Paul did, to the servants of Christ that which they shall believe and do, and furnishing them with one bond of unity, one rule of faith and action, and one machinery for the attainment of perfection. He would have Apostles.

It is remarkable that among a people like us, who boast of their Bible Christianity, and will hear nothing but the Bible, there should be such vast provinces of the Word almost wholly unexplored ; that so many content themselves with ringing a few changes on atonement ; and that, on the precious foundation which God has laid in Zion, a poor superstructure should be reared, in which angels may search in vain for God's manifold wisdom, and men wrestle in vain for the plerophory of intelligence in the mystery of God and Christ. The practical exhortations of the Bible even a pious heathen may understand. Our Calvinistic points—true, it may be, in themselves—are by many among us held and announced in a form as applicable to an almighty fate as to the living God—the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. If we would be no more babes, ever lisping an alphabet—if we would be mighty in the Scriptures, and not mere evangelical philosophers,—we must search where our Lord bade His disciples search, in that Old Testament which has been forewritten for our learning. We must begin with a right view of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, not as a mere obsolete indication of a future atonement, but as a present treasury, out of which to draw divine instruction concerning God's whole purpose in Christ, concerning the Church militant and the Church triumphant. And we must ask of God to give us prophets, who shall unlock to us its long-hidden instruction, that every shadow may find its substance in the body of Christ. It is a vain boast that we have done with the shadows, if the substance is yet undeveloped among us.

If we would preserve the unity of Scripture, we must not only interpret it consistently with itself, and seek the understanding of the whole, but also impartially obey it all, as far as understood. If we bow to its authority, we must bow to it all. We must not be partial in the law. We must not dwell on those passages which chime in with our own one-sided and narrow system, and pass by those which we cannot well dispose of, or do not relish. We must not reverence com-

mands which we like, and condemn those equally explicit commands which we do not like. To play thus fast and loose with scriptural authority, when it takes the form of practical obligation, is neither honest nor safe. Now there are very many express commands in the Bible as to the daily duties of the Church which the Church of Scotland neither obeys nor intends to obey, but which other Churches, whom she abuses for their disregard of Scripture, do—with whatever darkness, formality, or mixture of abuse—actually carry out. Yet she boasts herself, nevertheless, the purest and most perfect upon earth; regards her nakedness as the adornment of the bride; and looks down on others as the slaves of superstition or the victims of delusion, who obey the Scriptures in things which she leaves undone. I do not here speak of scriptural commands touching the holy keeping of the individual soul, but of those ecclesiastical acts which Scripture expressly enjoins, and which must bring blessing in the observance and curse in the neglect. He that comes into court as a witness against others, or sits in judgment upon them, should have clean hands himself. He that would expose wrong-doers, must himself be both a doer and a right-doer. Till the Church of Scotland fulfils the many plain injunctions of Scripture which she now neglects, it would better become her to be silent as to the faults of others. We are then fit to avenge disobedience when our own obedience is fulfilled. And if the experience and judgment of the faithful, adverse to the fulfilment of plain scriptural commands, is pleaded as an argument against their obligation, we degrade that statute-book of God, of which we make such an idol, to the rank of human laws, which non-observance virtually repeals; and we substitute yet more dangerous glosses for those of Papal tradition, and a yet more dangerous licence for that furnished by Papal dispensation.

Finally, it is not enough that we so abide in the truth of God's counsels that we shall understand as well as believe the Scriptures, and that we shall find in each text that special meaning which its context and occasion indicate; but we must be catholic in our exposition and application. Every class of ministry has its own proper mode of handling and applying the Scriptures; and every class of men should be furnished out of them with the peculiar instruction which it needs. The Scripture is profitable, for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. If our application of the Word be all dogmatic, all prophetic, all evangelical, or all pastoral, that which would be true and

profitable in its proper place and measure, will produce a one-sided, morbid, and disproportioned Christianity, if displaced, exaggerated, or exclusively exhibited. Mannerism in religion is as bad as mannerism in art. The capacities of men for rule, for light, for instruction, and for suasion, must all be met and filled. And it is plain that if none but the religious wants of one class of minds, one section of the Church, or one nation of Christendom, be supplied, the rest will be overborne or left behind. The right thing is, that truth should be ministered in many forms, and that the idiosyncrasies of men should be preserved. God will not reduce His diapason to one tune, however beautiful, or put all men on one Procrustes' bed. He has appointed distinctions of ministry, which must be held sacred; and distinctions of character, in different parts of the body, which must be honoured, not obliterated. If there be but one class of ministry, His machinery is crippled, His truth monotonous, and His people unsupplied. His Word instructs us otherwise. He has given apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ unto a perfect man. Without these, that body in which His truth should be incorporated must be distorted and ill-grown; and the saints, in all climes and lands, and among men of all characters, must be disappointed of those who can understand their various feelings, or supply their various wants. What a waste of devout energies—what a destroying of God's righteousness by man's wrath—what a rivetting of the chains which we labour to break—what a nurture of our own self-complacency—what a hindering of our own progress—we might avoid if we acted on the following canons: in denouncing error, to be prepared with that truth of which the error is the counterfeit; in abolishing abuse, to establish the use; and to save from positive evil, not by mere negation, but by leading on to a higher positive good. To uncover the nakedness and sores of our brethren, is to do what Satan can do better than we. To heal and clothe them is a work truly divine. They who know less than the Papist, may irritate him. They only who know more than he does, can save him. The atmosphere is not purified by creating a vacuum. Neither is spoliation reform.

We have now sketched those good works of the Church which are both fair in the sight of men and profitable to them; we have also sought to measure her failure to per-

form them, and indicated the conditions of her yet being able to do so. Let us now shortly consider those works of the Church which are beautiful in the sight of God.

Of course, all that does good to men is also well-pleasing to God. In sending His Son into the world, God proved Himself the great philanthropist, as St. Paul says to Timothy. Moreover, all that justly pleases men must also please God. For, however man is debased by the fall, and is prone to find his pleasure in evil works, he retains a moral instinct which testifies to that which is comely and of good report. Though he crucified Him in whom all virtue was embodied, he still can discern—nay, often delight in and reward—virtue where it does not too directly condemn his own ways. This raised Joseph to Pharaoh's right hand. This made Christianity the religion of the Roman Empire; for the world would often gladly use the Church, even where it resists her sanctifying work. Lastly, there can be nothing done well-pleasing to God, which is not directly or indirectly profitable to men.

The domestic and social virtues are things which the Church is called to perform in common with all men. She is enabled to perform them better than all others; yet they are no distinctive mark of the Church. Their theatre is the world. There are, however, other works, of which the theatre is the house of God, and which none but the Church can perform. Throughout every dispensation, those in covenant with God have had duties peculiar to that covenant. And the Church, as standing in the last and highest dispensation of grace, has works to do peculiar to it, and surpassing, in goodness, power, and significance, both the relative duties of all men and the religious duties of prior covenants. These are the works of Christian worship.

I say, advisedly, *Christian* worship. Let it not be supposed that none but the Christian Church can worship God. Every man, as well as every angel, is bound to worship his Creator. Every believer on Christ, be he heathen, Jew, or Christian, is bound to worship God in Christ. Each man, according to his place, and the measure of revelation to him, can count upon grace so to do. We know from Scripture that, in spite of the fall of all men in Adam, conscience, the candle of the Lord, survives in man; and that the heathen who acts faithfully up to the light of his conscience, while debarred from higher light, pleases God. We know that many a devout heathen, although uncircumcised, worshipped the God of Israel; and that many devout heathens and Jews becoming, or although never becoming, members of Christ

by baptism, have yet believed in, and worshipped Christ. Nay, the faith that Christ is the Saviour, although it cannot of itself graff us into Him, is the condition of baptism. The Baptists have erred, not in requiring faith in those who are brought to the sacred font, but in not believing that God, in requiring that they be brought to it, also gives them, even as infants, the faith required—not an inference in logic, or a knowledge of dogmatic theology, but the looking with the heart unto Jesus.

All this, however, does not amount to the faith of a member of Christ, or enable men to offer such worship as the Church of Christ should offer. The Church is the body of Christ—of His flesh and of His bones—the temple of the Holy Ghost—the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. The Head and the members, as Paul saith, make one Christ, even as Adam and Eve were not two, but one. In being not only risen with the risen Christ, but seated with the ascended Lord in heavenly places; there, where else no creature can be, in the very presence of the unapproachable Majesty; and introduced by the blood of Christ into the Holiest of all, where the Shekinah is, we have not only the privilege, but the power, not only the power, but the duty, to present offerings to God which no other creatures can. We may not worship as heathens or Jews worship. We may not offer angels' worship. It is too low for us; not too high, as some would tell you. We stand before God in a Name which is above that of angels. And, as we are bound to fulfil every law which our great Apostle now speaks from the Father, so should every heavenly offering which our great High Priest now brings to the Father, not only crown our worship, but find therein its true expression on earth.

Yet this, our worship, does not abolish all past or inferior worship. The spiritual comes, indeed, after the natural; but, instead of abolishing it as unclean, it takes it up, comprehends and ennobles it. In so far as the worship under the law was merely a shadow, or type, of good things to come (that is, a type, not merely of Christ's atoning death, as moderns in their meagreness say, but of all that is now transacted in the Church, as the greater and more perfect tabernacle), in so far is that worship abolished. Herein lies the distinction between a type and a symbol. The symbol not only may be, but must be, simultaneous and co-existent with the thing symbolized. A type must disappear before the antitype, and cannot co-exist with it. That which has been used as a type may yet be used as a symbol; but its

typical use has ceased with the coming of the reality. Neither the Jewish nor the Christian dispensation, indeed, is the very heavenly things. But while the Jewish was merely a shadow, the Christian is the very image of them. Nevertheless, the Jewish worship was more than a mere type. Its form may have been typical; but in its essence it was the fulfilment of an abiding moral obligation, as much as that of the devout heathen. And the Christian religion has not abolished either Jewish or heathen worship in their essence; else its presence in the world would emancipate all but Christians from the duty to worship God. It has taken them both up into itself. Therefore it enforces both with a yet more intense divine sanction; as binding, not upon us as Christians, but upon all who are not yet grafted into Christ.

Neither must we think that no worship can be offered save in the house of God. The worship of the heart, in the closet, or upon the bed in the night seasons, is not only of great price, but is that without which all other worship is a positive offence to God. Public worship, if it interfere with private devotion, destroys its own *basis*; and prayer in secret finds its open reward in the corporate worship of the Church. Yet private devotion is a different exercise from family devotion; and family worship from public worship. The condition on which our worship is accepted is, that it accords with the relations in which we stand. As our personal standing, our family, our social, and ecclesiastical relations, are all alike of God, and therefore capable of harmonious co-existence, so should the different acts of devotion, suited to these places, be the supports, and not the rivals, of each other. Yet they cannot be so if they are not visibly distinct in character.

The head of the family is the priest of his house. Yet this, his office, stands in a totally different category from any office in the Church. It is a social, not an inferior ecclesiastical office. A family is not a fraction of a church; nor is a church an aggregate of families; yet a family is, like a church, not a mere aggregate of independent atoms, but an organized body. Its head learns in the Church how to occupy his social sphere; but that sphere is no department of a church. His office is sacred against usurpation by any other, whether a member of the household, a layman, or a clergyman. As a man, he receives blessing and strength through the ordinances of the Church; but as a family head, he is not to be deposed by any ordinance; and no superior

piety or ecclesiastical office can warrant another in usurping his functions. God has set him to bless: let no minister or pious brother bless in his stead. God has set him to pray: let no minister or pious brother pray in his stead.

Yet herein does the Church differ from the person, the family, or the State, that, while the latter are the creatures of Providence, and are merely sanctified by grace, the former is exclusively the creature of grace. In this it resembles the seventh day. While days, months, and years are indicated by natural phenomena, the week is an object of faith, an institution of God, indicated by no natural sign, and hallowed only in the eyes of those who believe in the work of creation, in the power of resurrection, and in the future restitution of all things. The physical and intelligent world around us teems with symbols of things in the Church. The whole training of the human race has prepared for its appearance. The whole types of the law instruct us in exact detail as to all its holy rites and discipline.

The Church itself is not only even now that for which all natural things exist, the focus round which they gravitate, but it is the very image of heavenly things, the germ and mystery of that kingdom which shall be revealed on earth at the Second Advent of Christ. Yet the Church is in itself no natural thing. Although now surrounded by natural things, and using them in God's service, it lies entirely beyond their bounds. It destroys evil, for evil is Satan's work; but it does not destroy nature, for that is God's work. It elevates all nature and natural relations. Yet it does not take rank with them, and is not apprehensible as they are. In common with them, it is a part of God's work; but it is not, in common with them, a part of the things that are. It is composed of men, but it is not human.

Of its worship, then, we speak.

Let us first bear in mind the distinction between the *worship* and the *service* of God. All worship is service, but all service is not worship. The preacher of the Word yields to God perhaps the noblest of all service. But when men, in their morbid jealousy of worship, and in their idolatry of preaching, call preaching, as some have done, the principal part of worship, and assign to it the central and abiding place, excluding both altar and fald-stool, they can only do so by doing utter violence both to the meaning of words and to the distinction of things. Preaching is for the quickening of our faith, the enlargement of our intelli-

gence, and the nourishment of our graces. Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. We are prepared by preaching for being devout and intelligent worshippers. To the lack of it we may, in great part, ascribe the blind superstitions of Greece and Rome. And, like every good work, preaching should be accompanied by prayer. But, although it is indispensable to lively and intelligent worship, it is in itself no part of worship. It cannot be so; the two exercises are in opposite directions; and the attitudes of those engaged in them are diametrically opposite. Both are alike necessary; but they are not, therefore, to be confounded. In the one case, we minister to man; in the other, we minister to God. In the one, we imitate Christ in bestowing blessing from the Invisible; in the other, we imitate Him in rendering devout homage to the Invisible.

To worship, is, in its true etymological sense, to count or declare any person or thing to be worthy. Its precise meaning, therefore, must be determined by the nature and place of the object worshipped. Worship is not always rendered to a superior. We can worship also an equal or an inferior. And though we worship a superior, that superior may not be divine. The magistrate is worshipful. Our parents are deserving of worship or honour. All our fellow-men are to be honoured or worshipped. In the marriage rite of the Anglican Church, the husband, the superior, worships the wife, though the inferior. And they who fulfil the divine command in calling the Virgin blessed, do really worship her, or hold her and call her worthy. In all such worship, we do, for God's sake—who is the fountain of all honour—honour each creature in the place where God has set it. But the worship which we give to any creature—superior, equal, or inferior—is only such honour as belongs to a creature. The sin, bordering on blasphemy, of Mariolatry, is not the worshipping or honouring of the Blessed Virgin, but the giving to her that place and honour which belong properly to God alone, and asking of her that which we should ask of God alone. In worshipping God, we give to Him that place and honour which belong exclusively to Him, and ask of Him those things which we can and should ask of none other. Acceptable worship must be consistent with the being and place of the worshipper, the relations of the adorable Trinity, and the constitution of nature. It must be symbolic of heavenly mysteries, proceeding from present grace, expressive of real transactions, and pregnant with heavenly hopes.

We have already named, as the first requisite of worship, that it proceeds from the heart. And every true deliverance from either the neglect or the corruption of divine worship must commence with the hearts of the worshippers, with the revival of faith and love; for the living God demands a living sacrifice. The self-righteous or slavish formalist, who, without burning love to God and man—perhaps without personal assurance through the blood of Christ—goes through his unmeaning routine, whether of Romish mummeries or of Protestant hypocrisies, puts an equal insult on the majesty of God, and on his dignity as a redeemed intelligence. As the Dissenter can imitate the edifice of the Churchman, so can the hypocrite ape his phraseology, and simulate his holy ritual. And the religious antiquary, who, like Saul when deserted of God, would find help in recourse to the faithful dead, and dreams that he is reviving the Church by re-imposing on his flock rites, justly or unjustly obsolete, before he has instructed his flock in their meaning, or kindled a holy desire for them, follows a course, in the literal sense of the word, preposterous. In thus urging his people beyond their faith, and bringing on them responsibilities without corresponding grace, he exhibits little of His tenderness who never broke the bruised reed, nor extinguished the feebly burning lamp. The principle, of which the silent worship of the Quaker exhibits the caricature, is one ever to be held fast, that, without the moving of the Holy Spirit in the heart, worship is worse than vain—the most hardening, instead of the most edifying of all things. And it is hard to say whether the dead bodily exercises of superstition, or the spiritual tortures of those who unremittingly wait on means of grace without the assurance of faith—who live in gloomy bondage to prohibitions without the joy of the Lord, and who, while they shudder at Romish austerities, labour to purchase by Protestant austerities that peace, at the end of their religious career, with which their career should have begun—are the more offensive to our Father in Heaven.

While the Quaker is right in what he maintains, he is wrong in what he rejects. Even he is not consistent. He is, indeed, consistent as to sacraments. He says, “I have the thing, I no longer need the sign.” But if the whole of religion lies in the posture of the heart, why have we bodies capable of postures? why have we reasoning powers? why have we Bibles? why have we ministers? and why have we churches and church-goers? If we worship with

the heart alone, we can worship in the closet as well as in the church; and alone as well at least, if not better, than together. It may seem a hard thing to say; it may look like contempt of personal religion; but all such notions are the judgment of God upon that exaggerated estimate of the individual soul, which, holding so cheap man's body and the mutual offices of saints, is on the high way to reject both the resurrection of the one and the communion of the other. There is no more dangerous error than to look upon all matter as unholy, and all mind as holy. Heathen philosophers and ancient heretics regarded all body as sinful, because belonging to the earth; and all spirit as holy, because emanating from God; and confounded the spirit of man with that of the Spirit of God. And they are in danger of a like error who confine the sanctification of man to one part of his being. God is the God and Redeemer, not of souls only, but of men. His Church is composed, not of souls, but of men. His Kingdom shall not annihilate matter. Nor shall the New Jerusalem be filled with souls. We are bidden to glorify Him in our bodies and in our spirits. When we shall be presented faultless before Him, it shall be in body, soul, and spirit. And till body, soul, and spirit are all united, and all holy, we shall never be fit for the full enjoyment or service of Christ. Man consists of three parts—body, soul, and spirit—all made by God, all corrupted by Satan, all redeemed by Christ. By one indivisible work of grace is man's spirit inspired, his intellect guided, and his body cleansed. The same truth which reigns in his spirit must be apprehended by his intellect, and exhibited in his bodily acts. The spirit of man is that which, although never to be confounded with the Spirit of God, is the noblest part of man's being. By it he holds communion with God, and receives the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and the life of Christ; so that the most constant bodily exercise, the most acute mental exertion, can neither procure nor maintain communion with God. But the communion thus obtained is shared by both soul and body; the indwelling thus effected pervades both soul and body; and the life of Christ thus imparted vivifies both soul and body *also*. The spirit is the dominant part of man's being. Where it is not in communion with God, no other part of man's being can serve God. Where it is, the body and soul also are introduced to divine communion, and qualified for divine service; man's thoughts are in captivity to Christ; and his members are instru-

ments of righteousness. But this is the case only where the spirit of man occupies its proper place. Where bodily affections rule man's being, he cannot please God. And where his mere intellect assumes to be the highest part of his being, and to depose his spirit from its pre-eminence, the only part of his being which can have immediate converse with God is set aside, and both intellect and body are a prey to Satan. That which philosophy regards as the triumph of man—the mastering of all things by enthroned reason—is really his ruin. While our spirit communes with God, our reasonings concerning God are true. If we break that communion, our reasonings are the folly of pride; and our very efforts by searching to find out God, debar us, as profane, from His sacred presence.

That every part of man should serve God, is shown in the nature of those sacraments by which man's divine life is imparted and nourished; for they address each part of his being. In holy baptism, the water affects his body; the words used, his intellect; the mystery of regeneration, his spirit. In the Lord's Supper, the bread and wine affect his body; the words used, his intellect; the mystery of Christ's body and blood, his spirit. And as the pride of Naaman the Syrian was humbled by the way of God in healing him, so is there nothing more calculated to abase the pride of man's reason, than the fact that, although not *from*, yet *through* brute matter—water, bread, and wine, used according to God's appointment—man obtains that which the most transcendent intellect could not attain to, the gift and nourishment of eternal life; and that the sucking babe or the veriest simpleton can enjoy, in his spirit, a communion with God, into which the mere intellect of the grown man or the wisest sage could never penetrate.

As God's grace reaches every part of man, so should man's worship proceed from every part of his being. Without body and soul, the worship of man's spirit is mere mysticism; without soul and spirit, mere mechanism. And mere reason, when it arrogates to judge, can never stoop to worship.

The anti-symbolist is too late with his objections. He should have been before the creation of the world, or before the appointment of the sacraments. All natural things are symbols of things spiritual. The ordinances of nature are the counterparts of the ordinances of grace. The body is the symbol of the mind. Without it, both the communion of the spirit and the exercise of the reason

lack their just expression. The countenance, the posture, the action, which indicate natural emotions, should indicate the spiritual also. It is an utter mistake to think that things are spiritual in proportion as they are un-material. Our renewal in Christ does not alter our constitution. The same body which had served sin must, with all its powers, postures, and actions, now serve God. As it is natural to laugh when merry, and to weep when sad, so is it natural to kneel at prayer, to stand at praise, to bow at the name of Jesus, and even to make that sign of the cross, for which, although so fearfully profaned and degraded to mummery in many parts of the Church, we have perhaps older and more universal testimony than for any other practice of the faithful. Some indeed have their natural sense of propriety obliterated by prejudice. There are those who look on the prayer of the minister, with his back to the flock, as essentially Popish. But surely the first dictate of common sense would be to say that, when men look different ways in prayer, they are praying to different gods; that, when they look all one way, they are praying to one God; and that, if the minister be the leader of his flock, he should appear at their head. A form of worship, the excellence of which consists in the contradiction of everything which we should do in natural things or in similar circumstances, is mere obstinate fanaticism. The man who takes off his hat in his own house and keeps it on in God's, is a self-convicted fanatic. So also with our words. If the Eternal Word is the declarer of the invisible Father, and if our own word should not, as Talleyrand said, conceal, but reveal our thoughts, the words with which we approach God should be at least as select and reverent as those with which we approach an earthly potentate. Familiarity, loquacity, bombast, and rambling speech, which are offensive in the world, are yet more offensive in the house of God. And if it is disrespectful to men to deluge them with our ill-ordered crudities, it is doubly so to God. So also with our dress. St. Paul did not count it carnal to enforce divine proprieties by appealing to the dictates of nature. As there is in the State a common law of the land, anterior to all statute, so is there in the Church. Nature teaches us that our dress should be both consistent in itself and in keeping with our place and occupation. Silk stockings do not consist with a smith's apron. No man ploughs in his Sunday clothes, or goes to court in a shooting-jacket. There are diverse dresses for

the shop, the street, and the drawing-room. The weaver does not wear ermine, nor does the king dress like a groom. Were the soldier and the priest to exchange garments, they would do as much violence to the instinct of propriety as when men and women change garments. In like manner, however ministers of Christ may soberly dress on the street, where they appear merely as members of society, yet in the house of God, when they minister in the heavenly courts, they should have vestments appropriate to that place. This we see, not in the Romish and Greek Churches only, but in almost all Protestant Churches. We here form the rare, almost singular, exception. In the Anglican Church, the distinction, both of office in the abstract, and of occupation at the time, is expressed by dress. And in Scandinavia, where the Church is so ultra-Protestant that to this day no Romish worship is tolerated save in the Queen's chapel, the distinctions of clerical dress, founded both on office and on occupation, are so marked and various, that a pious but narrow Presbyterian would cry out, "Popery!"

Furthermore, God has for ever put the stamp of His displeasure on that devotion which is divorced from the use of all natural things, by expressly appointing the use of inanimate creatures in baptism, in the Lord's Supper, and in prayer for the sick. In the latter, oil is, or should be, used; not indeed as an instrument of blessing, for it is the prayer of faith that heals, but, by God's appointment, as the sign of a spiritual thing. In the two former, water, bread, and wine are used, not only as signs, but as instruments of spiritual blessing. As God will not limit our enjoyment of nature to one sense or channel, so will He not have us to be edified in one way only. We must not measure the Christians of other climes, in whom sentiment predominates, by the standard of dry northern reasoning. Their ideas may be less clear, but their piety may be greater. And that which those trained in one way could not either be edified by, or even do with a clear conscience, may be most edifying to, and most devoutly done by, others. Our cold headwork may have cleared our religious atmosphere from the mists of superstition and idolatry, but it may have, at the same time, robbed us both of much warmth of faith in divine mysteries, and of much refreshing rain from Heaven. All that meets our senses in the house of God should be in keeping with our occupation there. A minister of Christ is not made by a vestment, or unmade by the want of it. The

worship of God is His worship, whether in a barn or in a cathedral. We must never confound accidents with essentials. But that mind must be grievously narrowed and distorted which is more edified by worship in a barn or a lecture-room than in a cathedral. It may be better pleased, as all bad taste is best pleased with bad things; but to say that it is more edified, *i.e.*, built up on Christ, thereby, is an utter misnomer. Christ is Lord of all things, as well as Head of the Church. He has redeemed not only men's souls, but all the wood and stone, sound, savour, and colour, of this world. He claims the worship of all things, even as Moses and David claimed it for God. He requires their use, each according to its properties, though in a manner agreeing with our present humility. He claims a house which shall never be used save as a church, and which shall be so built that it cannot be mistaken for anything else. He claims that it shall be so arranged and decorated, that each part of the building shall speak a language corresponding to the acts transacted there. Meretricious ornaments, and symbols misplaced or meaningless or not understood, are indeed distracting to devotion; but ornaments and symbols, intelligently used, harmonizing in order and nature with the things transacted, are not only not distracting, but helpful to devotion. It is surely good that our eyes should light on objects expressive of that truth with which our hearts are occupied; and that gradation of symbols should express gradation of worship. It were, indeed, a triumph of faith to be capable of celebrating divine worship in a theatre; but it were a trial to which our faith should not be exposed, and in the necessity of which we should not glory. At the same time, we must remember the word, that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Those who can use such subsidiary helps in intelligent faith, are strengthened by their use; those who cannot, are weakened. The use of such things may be a sign of progress, or an attendant upon decay. They who can use them should not despise those who cannot; neither should they who cannot use them judge those who can. It is surely better that our eyes should rest upon a religious work of art than on a king's portrait, a coat of arms, or a pot-house sketch. It is better that art should sometimes serve God than always serve the world. The powers of music are capable of being redeemed to God's service. And not only is it better to hear a sacred than a profane tune, and good music than bad; but we more honour God by using both instrumental and vocal

music, than by using the latter only. We may measure the force of prejudice in all such things by this, that the children of Scottish iconoclasts do not scruple now to set up images of their favourite preachers; and that, in many a parish church, where a cross would fill the pious with alarm, the symbol of the dove graces the pulpit. The Russians, who count it sacrilege to eat a pigeon, have no difficulty with a lamb.

There is, however, yet another form in which the creatures are used in the worship of God. This is the payment of tithes and offerings. Although many are in use to contribute largely of their wealth to religious objects, few regard such contribution as an oblation to God—a tribute to His majesty, and a testimony of thankful obedience. Tithes and offerings stand on different footings. Offerings are the expression of love; tithes the fulfilment of a bounden duty. The payment of tithes is, by many, regarded as an exclusively Mosaic, and therefore obsolete, institution; and its continuance in the Christian Church as a sign of priestcraft and legal bondage. There never was a grosser mistake. In point of fact, Abraham and Jacob paid tithes, as a matter of course, long before the giving of the law. They fulfilled a duty which, although fulfilled by the faithful alone, rests upon all men. God requires the tithe of our increase, in homage to Him as maker and possessor of heaven and earth. It never has been ours, to be disposed of as we please. He has retained it, as the *reddendo* of our tenure, in giving us all things to use and enjoy. To yield it is the way to be blessed, not impoverished. They who rob Him cannot prosper. Justice to God is the first of all justice. And to devote to our own religious objects the tithes which should be rendered to God, is to be bountiful with another's wealth, and to be generous before being just. The tithe is not due from one species of possession only. St. Augustine, in reproving the Church for their slackness in paying it, reminds them that it is due not only from the harvest, but from all men's gains. They who commute the tithe into a State allowance or an annual tax, a legal debt or a free-will offering, may furnish the same, or a greater sum of money, but they forfeit the blessing attached to the fulfilment of God's ordinance. And those mercantile and other classes who escape even the substitutes for tithe, are still more cut off from the blessing, and exposed to the curse of James on the rich. The claim to tithe is not a claim between man and man, to be ascertained by human

inquisition, and prosecuted for in courts of law. The payment of tithe is a great act of duty and conscience. The mere payment of the money is of no value if it be not done in the intelligence and alacrity of reverent faith. God does not need the money; but He gives it to the ministers of His house, as He did of old, first to Melchizedek, the high priest of patriarchal religion, and then to the Levites under the law, whose only portion He was. This constant obligation of all men in all ages was not abrogated, either through its enforcements on some as an ordinance under the law, or through the superseding of the law, in which it did not originate, by the Gospel. On the contrary, the Gospel has given us a better opportunity, a clearer argument, and more grace for this form of divine worship than before. Christ is the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. We are the true seed of Abraham. And that which Melchizedek received from Abraham, Christ receives from us. The Christian covenant does not differ from the Jewish in this, that we pay no tithe; but that, while the Jew paid it to men that died, the Christian pays it, as the Epistle to the Hebrews says, to Him, "of whom it is witnessed that He liveth." God giveth the tithe to the Son of Man, and He to those whom He sends, as the correlative of their divine mission. And it is, at the same time, the divine test of our faith that God is God, and that He hath made Jesus Lord and Christ. Every verbal acknowledgment of God's lordship is feeble, if we will not make it in fact, by giving to Him that which belongs to Him as Lord. The Lord has winked at the ignorance of His children, and blessed them in spite of their robbery. But, once certified of their duty, they are no longer guiltless as before. It is the obligation of every man, and the yet more sacred obligation of the Christian, to seek an altar where homage may be rendered unto the Majesty of Him who made and possesses all things, with the tithe of our increase.

Acceptable worship must not only occupy the whole of man's being, and embrace the use of the inanimate creation, but also be offered as the worship of one body. Public worship is not the mere devotion of congregated individuals. In this matter, the Romanists who assert, and the sectaries who despise, ecclesiastical unity, exhibit the same error. Among the latter, worship is no more than the individual devotions of the minister, and of those present; because there is no faith in the Church as an organic unity. In the former, partly from a wrong conception of organic unity, and from

its confinement to the priesthood, partly from the use of a dead language, while the priest celebrates a worship which should be corporate, the people are there, not as joint offerers of the same, but as mere assistants at his worship ; and while he is offering the worship of the Church, they are occupied with their own private devotions. Yet, even where the unity of priest and people as one worshipping body is recognized, the existence of separate, if not rival, churches, marked off by national frontiers or ecclesiastical schisms, renders worship truly catholic impossible. The worship of such churches may be a unity, but it is a unity constituted by a fragment, and, therefore, must be itself fragmentary. If we will have National, Romish, Presbyterian, or even Apostolic Churches, as things exclusive in the body of Christ, we shall have National, Romish, Presbyterian, or Apostolic worship, as things exclusive in Christian worship. We shall have the one Sacrament, of Baptism or the Lord's Supper, split or multiplied into National, Romish, Presbyterian, and a hundred other baptisms and tables. We shall have the one ministry of Christ split or multiplied into ministries of every name. And those glorious ordinances, sacramental or ministerial, which the one Head has given to the one body, will be torn to pieces by grasping sects, and prostituted to be the landmarks of those frightful misnomers—schismatic communions. Whatsoever is said or done in public worship, should be so delivered out of every artificial and particular category, as to be evidently worship common to the whole. But how can this be ? How can the prayers or praises suitable to the whole body, be framed by those who occupy a place, and pursue objects, wholly uncatholic ? All that is really catholic in the ritual of the different sections of the Church, is a legacy from those times when Christendom was one. Every attempt now to frame catholic prayer or praise is an utter failure. The more that ancient style is aped, the more apparent is the forgery. If catholicity is not in us, it cannot come out of us. And although we in Scotland have, by our retention of the Psalms of David, vindicated their typical inspiration, and preferred a deep and catholic form of praise to the mere utterances of individual piety, yet in almost every other Protestant country the Church is flooded with a subjective hymnology, which, while often poetically beautiful, and suited to private edification, has nothing to do with the great objective corporate interests, duties, and transactions of the Christian Church. None can teach the Church how to worship as one body but

those who, belonging to no party section, and set over the whole body by Him who at the first taught His Apostles how to pray, gather up under themselves, and express, the collective piety of the whole. This they can hardly now do without a written liturgy, as well as a written creed.

Finally, as God should be worshipped by one body, so should He be worshipped in one way. All services of worship are not of one character. They vary with the occasion. But they should all be conducted on one principle. This is clear, alike from the symbolism of natural things, from the past dealings of God with His people, and from the present requirements of the saints. Was there ever an earthly monarch, however fatherly, who allowed his subjects to approach him at all times, in all places, in any way, or for any purpose? The laws of his court prescribe the way. And shall the King of Heaven have less right to dictate the way of approach to Him? Or shall we, on the plea of peculiar piety, be privileged to break through, and to set all His ceremonial at naught? The greater our attachment to Him, the more welcome should His appointments be, and the better should we understand their excellence. When God separated Israel to Himself as His especial worshippers, He prescribed most minutely the manner of their worship. We cannot believe that His injunctions were so arbitrary, that Israel might have equally well worshipped Him quite otherwise. These injunctions were the exhibitions of a wisdom as unchangeable as Himself. In their typical character they have passed away before the reality; but the eternal principles of nature and grace which they embodied remain. Israel were a type of the Church; their deportment, a type of ours; the dealings of God with them, types of His dealing with us; their tabernacle ordinances, types of the ordinances in the Church militant; their temple ordinances, types of those in the Church triumphant. In like manner, the worship celebrated in the tabernacle was a type of that which the Christian Church should offer. It were a strange thing indeed if, as many dream, the most perfect dispensation of God, the very image of heavenly things, and mystery of the kingdom, that in which the presence and guidance of God surpasses all that is past, should, nevertheless, be distinguished by this, that, in those weighty matters of Church government and divine worship by which we are trained for our eternal occupation, all is left to the arbitrary arrangement even of the most pious among men. We have, indeed,

in the New Testament no cut and dry Church constitution, code of laws, or rubric of worship, because the living stewards of God's mysteries should be ever abiding with the Church. But we have, in the types of the law, a pattern of her constitution and duties, exactly where it ought naturally to be sought for ; and we find that pattern referred to in the very part of the New Testament where we should expect the reference. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (written to show converted Jews how, as Christians, they had the abiding substance of all their dissolving shadows), that pattern, opened and applied by the light of living prophecy, is recognized and sanctioned, as the right compass by which Apostles should steer in governing the Church and ordering her worship. They who despise this pattern will ever be carried about by the subjective fancies of men, and will never succeed in doing God's will in earth as in heaven. The keeping of His charge as to the way of worship—not lawless and rambling acts of devotion—is the true hallowing of His name, and the only road to perfection and victory. If He has prescribed to us a holy ritual, the neglect of that is not only a thing obstructive to our own progress, but a positive sin. Under the law, express provision was made for the confession and forgiveness of those religious acts in which the rubric of God was neglected or violated. And the sin of Christendom, in not knowing or not willing to worship God in the way which He has prescribed, is one which the lapse of eighteen centuries has accumulated over our heads to an extent we little dream of—a sin of which, like the good king who recovered the law, we ought most bitterly to repent and seek the remedy.

Let us now consider the most prominent features of divine worship.

It is singular that a people like ourselves, whose religion is often so gloomy and destitute of holy confidence, and who make such a merit of gazing on our own vileness instead of God's goodness, should, nevertheless, enter on the public worship of God without the confession of sin. And, independent of this inconsistency, if we regard worship as a great transaction before God, both real in itself and symbolical of the course of the Church from her origin to her consummation, surely we should commence our worship with the acknowledging of that sacrifice which forms our sole access to God, and with the application of that sacrifice to the purging of our consciences. The fire of God which consumed the sacrifice of old, was a type, not of His

wrath, but of His acceptance. Yet that which He accepted was not the natural man, but the new man in Christ—the whole burnt-offering. And as that burnt-offering cannot be obtained save by the judgment on man's sin, and cannot be offered save in the assurance of this fact, so should that act of worship which symbolizes the burnt-offering be connected, both with the acknowledgment of sin and with the assurance that, by that Cross to which we confess, the quarrel of God with man was ended. Without entering into any of that prevailing casuistry about absolution, which the abuses of the confessional and the prejudices of Protestants have excited, it will suffice to observe, that if Christ is with us, not after the fancies and feelings of dreamy mystics, but in the palpable form of operation through His own ordinances by the Holy Ghost, and if the Church is the theatre for the mutual action of God and man, then the same Spirit who prompts us to audible confession, should prompt us to desire an audible assurance, also, that God has accepted our confession. No severity of self-imposed contrition, no flight of pious imagination, can ease the burdened heart, as that word of absolution does, with which God, by His minister, comes forth to meet the returning sinner. The Scriptures are the record of God's dealings, the treasury of His promises, the pledge of His faithfulness; and their public use, in reading them aloud before the Lord, besides being, like their private, for our instruction, also contains the element of presenting to Him His own word wherein we trust, and, by the Creed of the Church, confessing His name therein declared, with all that obedient joy which finds its utterance in the accompanying use of holy psalmody, both vocal and instrumental, both intelligent and prophetic.

All prayer should be suited to the circumstances of him who offers it. What can be more out of place than that the head of a family should occupy the time of family devotion, not in invoking blessings directly connected with family relations, but in expatiating over all the affairs of the Church Universal; as if no prayer for these things were offered elsewhere? or that the simple duty of giving thanks for our daily bread should furnish the occasion to wrestle, it may be for half an hour, in prayer for all imaginable things, whether promised by God or not? Such mistaken piety is the counterpart of that which would, in the house of God, supplant public prayer by all the private emotions and burdens of individuals.

But a yet more important thing is, that our public prayers

shall be really prayer. Much is said in extempore prayer by truly pious people which really means nothing. When I pray that I may be made thankful, at a time when I ought to be actually giving thanks, I am escaping from the performance of a present duty, by presenting a pious petition. And when I pray that I may *have been* edified, I am speaking without meaning in thus asking for a past thing. I either have or have not been edified. My prayer cannot alter the fact. But I here point not so much to the sincerity of prayer, as to the distinction between pious exercises which really are prayer, and those which are not. The law contained very specific directions, both positive and negative, as to the constitution of that incense by which prayer was typified. It declares not only what should enter, but what should not enter, into its composition. While public prayer ought to be the most comprehensive of any, its genius forbids both the minuteness and the licence of secret prayer, because the former is the prayer of a body, not of a person. And there are many things, in themselves excellent, which are nevertheless wholly out of place in public prayer, and which, if introduced into it instead of its proper elements, will confound its character and destroy its efficacy. These may be found in many of our own pulpit prayers, and in almost all liturgical attempts of modern date. How many prayers are mere rambling harangues, disquisitions, and reasonings; preachings at men under the pretence of speaking to God; and attempts to instruct God, instead of asking in the faith that He knoweth what we need, and that we have the things we ask of Him! How many are mere strings of holy texts, instead of real petitions! How many are bursts of fulsome flattery and turgid oratory, with which, as the Orientals often do, we disturb the propriety of humble request, and exhibit ourselves, instead of pleading with God! How many prayers are called wrestling with God, which are the mere fury of excited flesh, or the fixed idea of fanaticism! How many a supposed gift of prayer, as men say, is the mere familiar, profane, and rambling loquacity of rapid association, empty and faithless in proportion to its fluency! How many prayers are defiled by the mock humility of standing afar off and smiting on our breasts, when the matter in hand is, with a clear conscience to draw nigh and ask in faith, nothing doubting! And how many teem with expressions of devotedness to God, without presenting any of those requests which shall make our devotedness practical! From all these things our public

prayers must be cleansed, if they are to ascend as incense on high. The prayers handed down to us by the primitive Church alone answer to the ideal of public prayer. And to this day the prayers of the Romish Liturgy, save where corrupted by false doctrine and idolatry, are, for terseness, force, and reverence, the best models we have.

But all prayers, even when genuine and suited to public worship, are not alike. Not only the types of the law indicate, but the letter of St. Paul's Epistle to Timothy expressly marks, their distinction. "Supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks," answer not only to the various circumstances of men, but to the various classes of ministry which are respectively conversant with these circumstances. In supplications, we express (often, as in the Anglican Litany, to Christ, the proximate helper) the need of man, by the lips of those ministers whose pastoral experience causes them best to know it. In prayers, specially so called, we beseech God to preserve (for His people and purpose sake) the course of this world, by the lips of those who publish His grace to men. In our intercessions, we wrestle with God for the finishing of His mystery, by those on whom lies the perfecting of the Church as the bride of the Lamb. In our thanksgivings, we celebrate His faithfulness, and lay hold of His promises concerning things not seen, by the lips of those to whom He reveals His secrets for His Church's good. A Church in which prayer is all of one kind, or a confused jumble of penitence, petitions, and thanksgiving alternately interlarded, makes no progress. And without various provinces of ministry, various provinces of prayer cannot be developed. Division of labour, the sign of social civilization, is also the condition of godly order and spiritual advance. Without that fourfold ministry of which the Scriptures speak, not only do the various offices of Christ lack their due expression, but the fourfold constitution of man is not fully addressed. If there have been times and countries in which the Church has been overlain by priesthood, regular or secular, we need only look, for an opposite picture, to almost every Protestant land—with its overgrown parishes, its solitary parish ministers (unguarded, uncounselled, and unaided), and with its rare religious services—to be convinced how utterly impossible it is, with such a machinery, to keep the children, or fulfil the purposes, of God. The only pledge for the continuance of such a system lies in the deadness of the people to their spiritual privileges, wants, and dangers. Were the

spiritual wants of God's children what they would be, if they were truly alive to God and desired His constant guidance and manifold care in all their daily concerns, and did they meet for divine worship as frequently as they ought, the ministry that is among us could not meet the demand for a day. But if we will not let God fill us with spiritual desires, and will not labour till they are satisfied, we shall have the dreadful alternative of spiritual perils, from which the ordinances that are can neither shield nor save us. Nothing but the fulness of Christian blessing can exclude the curse. The various efforts of the faithful after more frequent joint edification, in prayer-meetings and otherwise, testify how the infrequent worship of our Churches fails to satisfy man's spiritual desires. And when we reflect, not only that the primitive Church, besides communicating every Lord's-day, met for worship frequently during the week, but also that the types of the law directly point to morning and evening prayer as the law of God's house, we cannot help feeling how the faith and piety of the Church are impaired by celebrating divine worship only once a week, in a meagre and mutilated form. If the blessing of services appointed by private persons is so great, how much greater would the blessing be if those appointed by God were observed by God's ministers! Moreover, does it never occur to us, how unlikely it is that a Church of modern organization like ours, which is almost solitary in its refusal to commemorate either the birth, death, and resurrection of the Lord, or the giving of the Comforter, should be right in this, and all other Christians in every age and clime wrong? Or how can we reconcile it to our conscience, that, while we are impelled by nature to commemorate annually so many family and social events, the year rolls round without any notice of events pregnant with thousandfold importance to each and all of us? Who can call this piety and purity?

I cannot, however, quit this branch of our subject without adverting to one part more of divine worship—the celebration of the Lord's Supper. That which is transacted in the house of God has two great elements—a ministry of grace from God to man, and a ministry of worship from man to God—that descending and ascending on Jacob's ladder, which Christ applied to Himself, and to all the intercourse of God and man through Him. This is especially seen in the right and full celebration of the Lord's Supper. It was instituted in order that the divine life

which we have received in holy baptism may be nourished by Christ Himself, who said, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." They who, having divine life, hunger and thirst for divine nourishment also, and who can by faith discern the Lord's body—that is, who can believe that in receiving bread and wine they are also receiving Christ's body and blood—such persons will hail with joy every occasion, however frequent, of obtaining that nourishment. The Lord's Supper will be to them, not a rare and gloomy ceremony, for which they prepare themselves by a few days' curbing of worldly lusts, and the effect of which is as transient as its return is troublesome to the flesh; but a royal feast, for which, with a clear conscience, a humble mind, and a glad heart, they have a true appetite; a thing as necessary to their spiritual existence as earthly food to their natural health and strength. As disease in the natural body may unfit man for eating the diet of health, so may God's children be (and alas! how many thousands, yea millions, are!) in a state of spiritual weakness and disease, which unfits them for their daily spiritual food, which makes their presence at God's Table an offence and not a joy to Him, and out of which a supply of food greater than they can bear will never deliver them. Yet such is not the normal, but the abnormal state of the children of God. The infrequency of communion is one great and certain cause of the low ebb at which our present religion stands. For it no artificial means of revival can compensate. On the other hand, the unbelief of those who communicate is the too obvious cause of the divers sicknesses, both spiritual and corporeal, with which the Church is afflicted. In most of the liturgies used by such Protestants as have liturgies, the prayer is made, that that holy sacrament which the ancient Fathers called "the medicine of immortality," may be to us for health both of body and soul. And Paul, in rebuking the Corinthians for their profanations of the Lord's Supper, and for their not discovering the consecrated elements to be more than mere bread and wine, which, although they feed the body, have no power to feed the spirit, says, "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep," because they are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. By this the Apostle clearly implies that the consecration of the bread and of the cup by Christ, through His appointed minister, does make them to be the body and blood of the Lord, whether worthily or unworthily received; and that,

although none can be edified by partaking thereof save those who receive them as Christ's body and blood, yet the very guilt of those who receive unworthily lies in this, that, while they have received that body and blood, they have not received them as such, and, although edified by collateral exercises, have not been fed by the Sacrament. Men exclaim against the assertion of reality in sacraments, as if it were the Roman Catholic dogma of the *opus operatum*. But the two things are *toto cælo* different. That life-destroying dogma is, that the consecration by the priest carries the blessing even to *unbelief*. That we utterly deny. But, while we do so, and admit that the blessing is dependent on faith, we maintain that the thing by which the blessing comes is as really there, when unbelief draws no blessing out of it, as when faith does. If it is a Romish heresy to say this, it is as much so to say that the word preached is the Word of God, whether received or rejected. And if so, what becomes of all the thundering periods in which every awakening preacher sums up his discourse, by reminding his hearers of their responsibility in rejecting his appeal? If the sacrament is no sacrament save when received in faith, the Gospel of God is no gospel unless it is believed, and its rejecters have no guilt. They only who believe the Gospel are saved. And no *opus operatum* of preaching can save them without faith. Yet if they reject it, they have rejected the Word of God. So also with the Lord's Supper.

Now, as to the nature of the nourishment thus provided for us, St. Paul tells us that it is feeding on a sacrifice. (1 Cor. x. 15.) He illustrates this by reference both to heathen and to Jewish worship, in showing that this principle pervades all religion, true or false; and that they who eat that which they have sacrificed, do thereby enter into communion with him to whom they sacrifice—Gentiles with devils—Jews and Christians with God. Not that Christians are distinguished from Gentiles by having no sacrifice; but that they sacrifice to, and have thereby communion with, the true God. Christ is indeed the only atoning sacrifice. If the Church has any sacrifices, they cannot be either the rivals, the substitutes, or the completion of His. We believe that the bread and wine continue to be bread and wine. So do we believe, in the words of the Anglican Liturgy, that Christ did on the cross "offer one, perfect, and all-sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world." As the mystery of God in the sacraments transcends the senses, but never

contradicts them, so does the Lord's Supper, in applying Christ's sacrifice, neither abolish, complete, nor repeat it. Yet Christ is our only sacrifice in no higher sense than that in which He is our only food. And if the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper carry with them the virtue of His *life*, not by any physical change of property, but by divine appointment, so also do they carry with them the virtue of His *sacrifice*. In all our worship we acknowledge *in word* that our only access to God is, not through our own piety or the mediation of creatures, but solely through the sacrifice of Christ. Why, then, should that acknowledgment be limited to word only, when God supplies us with another, if not a higher, form in which to make it? If we have, in the consecrated elements, that which, to faith and spiritually, yet really, is the body and blood of Christ, is not our presenting before God these symbols of Christ's sacrifice as legitimate a mode of appealing to that sacrifice, as our making mention of it in word? Should not the two go together to render our appeal complete?

The profane attempt of the Roman Catholic Church to explain, in a physical manner, a heavenly mystery, and the absurdity and idolatry to which that attempt has given rise, have thrown Protestants into the opposite extreme, of banishing from their idea of the Lord's Supper every element but that of mere communion, of closing their hearts against the analogies and express testimony of Scripture, and of shutting their ears against the united voice of the Fathers as to the many-sided import of this sacrament, centuries before any shape was given to those Romish errors which the Council of Trent has stereotyped. The showing forth of Christ's death includes much more than communion. It implies not only the *enjoyment* of the *fruits*, but the *presenting* of the *memorial*, of His finished sacrifice. This the Anglican Church did long after the Reformation, till the unworshipful influence of Geneva stopped it. This the Protestant Episcopal Churches in Scotland and America do to this day, not only feeding man, but worshipping God, with the holy sacrament. Hence the name Eucharist; because, in the Lord's Supper, we not only thank God, as at all times bound, for His blessings of providence and grace, but, holding in our hands, or having before Him and us, the memorial of Christ's finished sacrifice, we thank God, both by word and by deed of oblation, for His unspeakable gift; show forth Christ's death before God, angels, men, and devils, and, on the ground of the sacrifice thus symbolized, ask, not only

all things now needful for the Church and for the world, but also the perfecting of the saints that are alive, and those that are departed, in one body, at the appearing of Christ.

We may find this import of the Lord's Supper illustrated by a passage in the life of one of the most faithful ministers whom Scotland has produced in more recent times, who, when sick unto death, and celebrating the Supper, as he believed, for the last time with his people, thus spoke: "Jesus took bread. What is bread? Corn, cleared of the husk, thrashed out, bruised, ground down, baked in the oven, and then broken. That is Jesus, and that is our Food." And again: "We show forth the Lord's death. To whom? *To our God.* We break it before Him, and we *lift it up to Heaven*, and *tell Him* that His Beloved One was so broken for our iniquities; that through His blood we dare to say, 'Abba, Father!' *To the world.* We bid them draw nigh, to see what is our hope, what our calling, what our nourishment! *To the enemy.* We point to the broken symbol, and we tell him that we can defy him, we can resist him; for we live in Him who was manifested that He might destroy the works of the Devil."

We see hence how strictly true it is that, in the eyes of all who are not mere idolaters of preaching and preachers, ever, like the silly women of Scripture, learning, and, like them, never advancing—in the eyes of all who have a taste for the sweets of holy worship, the Lord's Supper contains much more than mere communion, and is at once the crown of all adoration, and the centre round which all other services range themselves—that, without which they lack their common basis, their proper connection, and their intelligent explanation. The Romish mass, besides all its other faults, contains the radical vice of excluding, or treating lightly, the communion of the faithful. Without communion, the Lord's Supper is not truly celebrated. But, without a Eucharistic oblation of Christ's body and blood, it is equally imperfect. We are thus caring for ourselves, without thinking of God's claims. The universal custom of regarding invitation to meat and drink as indispensable to true hospitality and intimate friendship, may teach us, by natural things, how our communion, both with God and with each other, is heightened at the Table of God. But if those suffer grievous loss who either cannot bear or cannot obtain frequent communion, those must equally, although perhaps unwittingly, displease God who selfishly and greedily appropriate the heavenly food, without having first rendered to

God their thankful homage, in presenting before Him the memorial of His Son's death. Indeed, such presentation should be found, not only at the time of communion, but on every more solemn occasion of worship.

Here, also, the types of the law come to our aid. Almost all commentators are agreed in regarding the ministry of the shew-bread as one type of the Lord's Supper; and it has also been shown by the best scholars that the shew-bread, or "bread of the face," properly means that bread which indicates the presence of God, and points to Jesus the true Bread. This shew-bread was not merely eaten. It was daily ordered or presented before the Lord. It was exposed, not merely to the eye of man, but also to the eye of God—a type of that act in which we should devoutly remind Him of the gift of His Son. And it was renewed every Sabbath. With this corresponded the ancient practice of the Church to celebrate the Eucharist every Lord's-day, and thus to furnish herself with a fresh memorial of Christ's sacrifice, as the basis of all her services, till the next Lord's-day came round—as a symbol of Christ's own sacrifice, completed on the cross, accepted at His ascension, and now constituting the ground of all approach to God until He shall come again.

Although unintelligent worship is unworthy of a man, the nurse of superstition and the cloak of vice, there is nothing so calculated to advance us in true piety and wholesome godliness of living, as the willing and intelligent exercises of holy worship, distinct from the hearing of sermons. Sermons are excellent, nay, indispensable, in their proper place and for their proper end; but when their importance is exaggerated, and their position false—when the altar is obscured or banished by the pulpit—they are like the cuckoo's egg, which is the death of everything else in the nest. They will dilute our doctrine, weaken our faith, and heathenize our hearts, while we are drinking in the words of idolized oratory. They place us in a false position. And thus, habituated to being addressed in what are called "Gospel sermons," as if we were not God's children, and to be fed with food inferior to the kernels of the wheat, we speedily sink to *be* what we are *called*. The very forms of speech in which we designate our religious exercises, are enough to convince us how false a position preaching occupies among almost all Protestants. How could people whose hearts are set on worshipping God, talk of "sitting under a minister," or speak at the hour of worship of going

to hear this or that favourite preacher? There is no occupation more akin to that assigned by Milton to devils, than that of discussing religious truth without worshipping God. To do so, as men do in Scotland, with the long face of the saint, instead of the sneer of the freethinker, instead of mending the matter, only makes the self-deception and danger the greater. And we need only look to Germany, where men, godless in their lives, renegades from every ordinance of the Church, and utter strangers to the house of God, spend their lives in bandying between man and man the discussion of the most sacred mysteries, and in bringing religious truth, as a province of science, to the tribunal of the learned, without any reference to the marital relation between Christ and the Church, to the communion and edifying of one body, and to the worship of God;—we need only to look there, I say, in order to see theology, the science of that God who should be known in His Church, converted into the most profane, corrupting, and conscience-searing of all occupations—in fact, to see the antitype of the sin, to be judged by the blindness of Sodom. In the Church, and nowhere else, has God commanded the blessing. In contrasting the withered souls of learned theorists with the flourishing hearts of ignorant believers, one may well say, “*Grau ist alle Theorie, und grün des Leben’s goldener Baum.*” Why, that very Athanasian Creed, the dry forms of which offend the so-called spiritual, and its damnatory words the so-called charitable, nobly says, “The right faith is, that we *worship.*” And Paul, the greatest of all Gospel preachers, tells us, in the Epistle to the Romans, what was the end of all his preaching,—to minister, or rather to transform into sacerdotal worship, the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost; in other words, in order that, by preaching, a Church might be gathered and taught, who, as living sacrifices and a royal priesthood, might offer themselves unto God in sacrifices of worship, on which His fire might descend, and, in consuming, accept them. If the Church is the temple of the living God, the offices of the Three Persons in the adorable Trinity should be clearly seen therein. That Trinity which reason proves is, after all, nothing but a triangle inscribed a circle. There only, where God acts, is His Trinity known, not as a fruitless dogma, but as a fruitful fact. As, in the anointing of Christ, we saw the Father who spake, the Son who was addressed, and the Spirit who descended, so do we see in the Church one God,

over all, through all, and in all: the Father who is worshipped, the Son in whom we worship, and the Holy Ghost by whom we worship: the Father in the operations, the Son in the ministries, the Holy Ghost in the gifts. Without worship, we fail to show forth the Father; without ministry, the Son. And when the gifts of the Spirit are quenched, the personality of the Holy Ghost is not testified unto. But when the Church, by her living action, testifies to all these things, then is she indeed seated in heavenly places in Christ; and her worship as much transcends that of angels, as the Name in which it is offered is more excellent than theirs.

But what is to be the issue of all our worship? We know what our attitude should be. Serving the living God, and waiting for His Son from Heaven. Just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel. We know what our occupation should be. Departing not from the temple, and serving God with fastings and prayers night and day. We know what our strength should be. That same Holy Spirit resting upon us, who descended at the first, as the earnest of the inheritance, and the seal of its heirs. And we know what our end shall be. The coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him. Literally, our *synagogue* unto Him. As the Jews of old came together in the synagogue, so do Christians come together in the house of God. But every coming together of the saints is imperfect, till we all come together—the faithful of every land, the departed of every generation—till we be assembled, not in an earthly building, but in a house not made with hands—not under an earthly minister, but under Christ Himself in person returned. How little do listless and carnal worshippers reflect on this, that every assembly of the saints is a symbol and earnest of their final assembly, and should be held in the living and daily hope of being summoned together by Christ Himself! How much would the thought, that such a glorious event was possible, disturb, instead of filling with ecstasy, the devotions of many a creditable worshipper! We tax those with presumption who would fix that day and hour which no angel knows—no, not the Son, but the Father only. And we do right. But is there not presumption as great in those who fix a period before which that day cannot arrive, and who settle it that they must certainly be long safe in their graves before the Lord shall come, though He cometh to judge the *quick* as well as the *dead*? Surely, if it is bad to wait for a time

which we ourselves have fixed, it is worse still, by fixing a certain long interval, to excuse ourselves from waiting at all! Truly, all the virgins do slumber and sleep!

While men have slept, the enemy hath not. He hath sown the tares. Every attempt to get rid of them has only endangered the wheat. The woman has hid the leaven; but the Man alone can purge that leaven away. It is vain to wash with fouled waters. It is destructive to put new cloth on an old garment, or new wine into old bottles! What boots it to summon Samuel up? He rises only to reprove us. What help can be in choosing new gods? They shall perish with us! What folly is it, with an ebbing life, to attempt the labours of Hercules; from an empty cistern to water the parched earth; or to sound out that Gospel of which we are not ensamples! What fresh cookery of stale food, what new nomenclature of worn-out machinery and blunted tools, can restore a thing *effete*? By what new confederacy of the defeated shall victory be won? Or from what part of the body to be saved shall salvation come? What nostrum of the hour shall heal those whose disease has baffled the express ordinances of the divine physician? Shall Inner Missions or Evangelical Alliances, Romish encyclicals or English committees, triumph where those ordinances have failed? When the Spirit is quenched, to what other help shall we turn? When the Church cannot interpret to men, or counsel them, who shall? When the flood reacheth to the neck, to what islet will men retreat? When God will judge His house, that it may judge the world, what shall it avail to skulk from one chamber to another? When the enemy investeth the city, what shall it boot to retire from the plain of Dissent to the outworks of Presbyterianism; from them, within the wall of Episcopacy; and from it, within the imagined citadel of Eastern Patriarchate or Western Popery,—if citadel and outworks alike are doomed? What shall prayer-meetings avail us, when no two are agreed touching anything they shall ask? What shall efforts avail, if we know not the right way of the Lord's working? What shall prophetic speculation avail, if we do not the work laid to our hand by God? What shall days of humiliation avail, if we know not the controversy of the Lord? What shall self-imposed vows help us, who break the vows of the Lord? How shall that newspaper tongue, which walketh through the earth, and boasts itself the new Mentor as well as the new judge of men, stepped into the office of the Church defunct—how shall it instruct us, if the

voice of the Comforter is unheeded and quenched? Lastly, what shall all the false Christs of this day avail us, who would rid mankind and the universe of the curse, without removing those sins of which the curse is the offspring and the recompense?

If any man defile the temple of God, him will God destroy. We are both the temple and the defilers. There were under the law leprous houses as well as leprous men. And as the house, scraped in vain, was abandoned and taken down, so is it now. The fair show only makes the sepulchre white. The mutual echo of peace will not change the facts. The breach in the unmortared wall cometh suddenly. The Church which saith, "I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," is ready to be spued out of the mouth of the Lord. At the very time when the Jews boasted most loudly of their temple, Jesus said, "There shall not be here left one stone upon another that shall not be thrown down;" He forsook it; and it became desolate and fell. As the cherubim of Ezekiel left their place, and, lingering, departed,—so is it now. Ye see the stones one by one taken down before your eyes. In every land ye hear the roar of the enemies in the congregation, and the stroke of their axes. And in this our land, where God in these last days first sounded the tidings of His mercy and judgment, and where those tidings were rejected, His spiritual judgment has passed through like a wedge. As Zechariah saith, the staff of beauty being broken among us, the staff of bands is broken too. A breach has come which man cannot repair. In a spiritual sense, blood has flowed in our streets. The stream of charity has been dried up, and embittered by the fire and the wormwood of theological rancour. Under the garb of godly zeal, our gloomy contentiousness, which carries out everything relentlessly to the death, has severed the very ties of nature. The life's blood of brethren has ever since been oozing out in internecine strife. And as the cockles sang while their houses were burning, so do those clerical jokes, by which the clergy take the lead in dispelling the fear of God and the halo of the truth, at once impoverish our own hearts and invite the blasphemies of the scoffer.

But the stones thrown down shall not be left unemployed. That great marrer of God's work who has procured their scattering, shall seek to gather them for himself. A temple of lies shall stand where the temple of truth should have stood. Satan has his best vantage-ground where his existence is denied, where all his works skulk under "powers

of nature." The obsolete devil has the greatest power. The useful and amusing devil is the prime deceiver. The flattering devil has the most abject slaves. Satan is a skilful fisher; he has a bait for every fish, and every kind of weather. Man is by nature the child of pride. When he has continued proof against those divine appliances which should have cast down every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, the rod of pride buds fuller than ever; and by the help of stolen light and prostituted grace, the creature which should have confessed "God made man," displays itself as "man made God." In every grade of society, in every department of occupation, under manifold phraseology, the same lie is told. The ruler sets himself as God, by ruling without Christ—the people, by ruling the ruler—the conqueror, by leading hosts to universal empire—the reformer, by his so-called restitution of all things—the philanthropist, by his endeavours, as the champion of impenitent humanity against an unjust providence, to abolish the curse—the merchant, by gathering the riches of the earth—the mechanic and scientific discoverer, by bending all nature to his use—the philosopher, in his impassive pride, by piercing to the secrets of wisdom—and the theologian, in foul prostitution of his office, by consecrating deeds of blasphemy, and by teaching men to worship man. The temple is there; it needs but the top-stone. And we shall hear the shout of its œcumenic welcome in every tongue of the Christian Babylon. Thus is the way of him prepared, who shall be king over the children of pride—who shall fulfil every lust in those that fear him—who shall establish the righteousness and glory of a man against those of God—who, speaking of the world, and by that world heard, shall command its universal homage—whose mark the false prophet shall impose—whom Jew and Gentile, Christian and heathen, shall hail as Messiah, and to whom every apostate Romish priest, every apostate Protestant preacher, shall burn incense and offer adulation. We may not forget how the one has already consecrated trees of liberty, and the other canonized in sermons the martyrs of revolution—each in his own way—both with equal baseness. The limbs of Antichrist confess their character, in boasting that their number is Legion. The house, swept and garnished, shall be filled.

Ye who boast over the Papacy as the last Antichrist, already fallen, know what worse thing awaits you. Ye who fondly dream that a few more Exeter Hall meetings, South Sea converts, Temperance Societies, and Ragged Schools will

transfigure the world that is into the world to come; ye who expect a kingdom without a king, a flood of mercy instead of a fire of judgment, a day-spring of glory without a night of shame,—read, while ye yet can, what the Apostle saith, that that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, not among blinded heathens, but in illumined Christendom. In the temple of God—not in Rome merely, but in every Christian sect—shall the blasphemy prevail ere the Messenger of the Covenant come to His temple. Ye who have consigned miracles to the shades of fable or the tomb of history, arm yourselves, if you can, with your hackneyed logic and powerless babblings, against Satan's miracles to come; and beware lest, if ye refuse the spiritual endowment of Paul, ye meet the fate of the sons of Sceva. (Acts xix. 14.) Ye who make miracles the test of truth, and not truth the test of miracles—ye who, not having that mind of Christ which is every Christian's birthright and shield, seek a sign like the heathen, and thus confess your own fall, tremble, lest God in His wrath permit Satan to take you at your pledge, and to lead you wondering after the beast. Ye who have pleasure in unrighteousness—ye who receive not the *love* of the truth, what shall your caution and precaution, your proud common sense or frivolous raillery, your flat materialism, your inductive philosophy, your cut and dry recipes against the Devil, avail for your rescue, when God, in vengeance condign, shall *Himself send you* strong delusion, the energy of error, to adapt you for faith in the energy of Satan? Ye who would stand alone, as ye say, with your Bibles and your God—ye garrison of a dismantled fortress, soldiers of a disbanded army—without discipline or *morale*, without command, commissariat, or arms, without unity of heart and operation, without captains of tens, of hundreds, and of thousands, under the great Captain of salvation,—how can ye pretend to be that host which the Lord of Hosts doth muster, or dream, as ye are, of turning to flight the armies of the aliens?

There is a certain prophetic school in this and other lands, who flatter themselves that they, by reason of their light, true or false, as to the future, are far in advance of other Christians. But they are not so. In the first place, their supposed light, obtained in the solitude of the study, and not in the communion of saints, runs great risk of being false; and, even if true, must be either wholly unprofitable or erroneously applied. Yet even where God, in His great

pity towards His scattered children, has (as in every age, so now) given true light to the students of His Word, the use made of it is utterly wrong. Of those who are, as men speak, believers in the Second Advent, how few remember, in the words of the *Te Deum*, that He, over whose advent they familiarly babble and wrangle, as about any question in science or politics, "cometh to be their judge"! How few who believe this, expect it! How few who expect it, hope for it! How few that hope for it, purify themselves, as He is pure whom they expect! How few that hope for it, and would prepare for it, remember that it is not individuals, but a Church that shall receive Him! How few who remember this, feel that the Church is unprepared! How few that feel this, have learned how God will prepare her! How few who know this, have really sought that preparation, have counted its cost, or have submitted to the pain of its second circumcision, or are really being prepared! Are they not rather, in false security and philosophic selfishness, feeding with speculations their own religious curiosity and self-esteem? Are they not as indifferent to the fate of men, and unwatchful themselves, as they who never speculate concerning things to come? Are they not really quieting those stings of conscience which tell them that they ought to be ready to meet their God, with the anodyne of speculation as to how the Lord will come? Are they not excusing themselves from coming to the help of the Lord, by vaunting their knowledge of His purpose? Are they not marking the course of His chariot, instead of riding in it? Are they not puffed up by solitary gnosis, instead of being edified in catholic love? Are they not in danger of being either paralyzed fatalists or active fanatics?

We are bidden to know when the day of the Lord is near, as expressly as we are forbidden to fix it. There have always been hasty and narrow-minded spirits who, exaggerating everything connected with their own little sphere and present time, have misapplied the predictions of God. But if ever we might argue a universal issue from a universal instinct, we may do it here. Go through every section of the Church, every province and grade of society, every land of Christendom; consult the fears or expectations of good and bad; ask the statesman, the churchman, the active, the contemplative, the newspaper editor, or the newspaper reader—in short, all not smitten with pietist blindness, or sunk in sensual security,—they will all, each in his own dialect, give the same answer; that God is judging the

green tree, and that the turn of the dry tree comes next. The *great* temptation, to take a false Christ for the true—the *great* tribulation, the imposition of Satan's mark—has come. In our days it has been spoken of; in our days it shall be done. All who dwell on *earth* shall endure it; but they who dwell in *Heaven*, who receive the seal of God, and are the first-fruits to God and to the Lamb, by which to sanctify and save the future harvest, shall escape it. To the Church in Philadelphia—not Romanists, but true Catholics—gathered out of every sect into unity; loving, in deed, not in word, all the brethren in Christ, and led on by God's own ordinances to perfection—is it said, "Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from that hour of temptation." Remember how Enoch escaped the flood. Remember how Elijah was translated. And see ye, in the Church of the Laodiceans, wickedly secure, the sin and peril of those who will not hear the knocking of the First-begotten, returning to claim the earth as His inheritance.

Many have been the labour-pangs of the Church. The last and worst must come. The man-child must be born. Christ must be perfected in us, the hope of glory. God is calling unto us, to awake and arise from the dead, that Christ may give us light. He is prophesying to the bones, and bringing bone to bone. He hath set before us an open door which none can shut. He hath given the sign, that the set time to favour Zion is come, by raising up those who take equal pleasure in all her stones, and favour all the dust thereof. He once more shineth forth from between the cherubim, the restored ordinances of His house. That same Elias, who mourns his people's ruin, suffering with them in the spirit of unity, is used to stay the curse by turning fathers to children, and children to fathers, by raising up Apostles to care for all God's children—Greek, Roman, and Protestant; and moving all His children to seek their care. And while the best-intentioned of men are groping in despair, and labouring in the very fire for deliverance, the Lord is giving those judges, as at the first, and those counsellors, as at the beginning, by whom alone Zion shall again become a faithful city. Jesus is about to come as He went. He went from Apostles; He comes again to His Church, espoused by Apostles unto Him. He went from those whose eyes followed Him into Heaven; He comes again to those whose eyes watch for His return. He went from one body; to one body He comes again. He will, as in

a moment, not only raise the dead, but summon the living up to meet Him. And they thereafter coming with Him shall not be the called merely, nor the chosen merely, but the *faithful*. Such are the true seed of Abraham, the true friends of Christ; they who do His commandments, they from whom He will not hide the thing that He doeth upon the earth. These are they who have the key to the riddle of this world's phenomena—who can give the right commentary on the present, and the right scheme of the future—who shall never be taken at unawares, or terrified by those things at which men's ears shall tingle and their hearts shall faint. Because they know before and understand those wonderful events which have terrified out of their slumbers the rest of men, these can lift up their heads, knowing that their redemption cometh. These are they who are profitable unto men. They can give a certain sound, by which to prepare for battle. Out of their belly flow living waters. Their mouth is a well of life. By their religion, pure in its source, undefiled in its course, the widow and the fatherless are visited in their affliction. These bear the marks which earn the beatitudes. These form the bride of the Lamb—the only one among queens and concubines—the virtuous woman, in whom the heart of her husband doth safely trust—that King's daughter, glorious within, who shall be brought unto the King in raiment of needlework—that second Eve, that ever-praised mother of all living, who shall not only rejoice, but reign, and whose children shall be instead of her fathers in the ages to come. By ministries proceeding from one glorified Head, shall that which is impossible with man be done, and that which eye hath not seen be revealed.

Brethren, I have neither addressed you as an accuser, nor made music before you on a pleasant instrument. I have sincerely endeavoured to help you on to perfection. Play ye not with prophetic pictures; but do the work to which ye are called, yielding yourselves to God. Desert not your posts; but be faithful there, till God come to your help. If ye will be doers of the work, ye shall know that the word is true; but if ye dishonestly trifle with it, ye shall be left to your questionings. Throw off from your hearts, your hands, your feet, the chains of that worse than Papal bondage, under which, in this land, ye are held, by the fear of man, the lust after intellectual zest, the tyranny of opinion, the force of prejudice, the subtleties of your hard-headed reasonings, and the infallible voices of your popular idols. That moral cowardice which now extinguishes your

individual manhood, eradicates your faith in God, and makes you the hired servants of men, is unworthy, I shall not say of Scotchmen, but of Christians. Call not your prison a palace. Admire not your own estate, but avoid it. It is sad enough. Say not, in your treacherous security, that all things continue as they were. Place not any work which you may have mapped out for God to do, between you and your reward. Know that He will cut short His work in righteousness. And in an hour when the best of us think not, the Son of Man cometh. Ye have passed the even and the midnight. Ye have heard the cock crowing. The morning cometh. I say unto you, "Watch!"

In this city, God has begun—not to increase Babylon by another sect, which assumes to itself the exclusive, and therefore schismatic, title of "Apostolic,"—but to build up, of living stones, from out of every part of His heritage, His "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church," on His own foundation; not on the mere word of deceased ministers, but on the offices of living Apostles and Prophets. See that ye are builded, ere it be too late, on the only foundation that shall stand. By Apostles and Prophets, God has begun to repair the ruins of His house, and to restore that observance of His holy ways which does, as a flying roll, now pass through Christendom, to save the obedient and judge the rebellious. By them he declares His judgment on Babylon. He will judge their judgment upon her. But those that hear and obey shall be counted worthy to escape all those things that are coming on the earth, and to stand before the Son of Man.

Beware of all human devices for the healing of your breaches, or human forms of unity. If God ever break down the barriers which ye have raised against yourselves, see that ye be reconciled, not with one another, as Presbyterians or Protestants merely, but with the whole body of Christ, by thankfully submitting yourselves to those to whom He entrusts the care, and by whom He will effect the salvation, of the whole.

THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

CALIFORNIA

339615

Works Published by THOMAS BOSWORTH,

198, HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON.

*** The figures at the end of the lines indicate the number of 1d. stamps required for postage within the United Kingdom.*

- FOUR DISCOURSES ADDRESSED TO YOUNG MEN. Pp. 64. 8vo. 1877. 1s. (1)
- ANDREWS'S (REV. W. W.) THE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC Church: its History, Organization, Doctrine, and Worship, together with its relation to the Churches. Second Edition. Pp. 48. 8vo. 1s. (1)
- ARMSTRONG'S (REV. N.) SERMONS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS, preached in different Congregations of the Church of England and Ireland. Second Edition. Pp. 442. Crown 8vo. 1870. Cloth. 6s. (6)
- HOMILIES ON THE EPISTLES AND GOSPELS appointed to be read in the Holy Communion Service throughout the year. Pp. 356. Crown 8vo. 1871. Cloth. 6s. (5)
- BOASE'S (GEO. C.) RESTORATION (THE) OF APOSTLES, AND the True Position of those who recognize them in relation to the rest of the Church. Second Edition. Cr. 8vo. Pp. 36. 1876. 6d. (½)
- BOHM'S (C. J. T.) LIGHTS AND SHADOWS IN THE PRESENT Condition of the Church. Nine Lectures on Christian Truths, peculiarly applicable to the Times we live in. Translated from the German. Second Edition. Pp. 330. Crown 8vo. Cloth. 1874. 5s. (5)
- CALL (THE) OF ST. PAUL TO THE APOSTLESHIP. Third Edition. Pp. 16. 8vo. 1876. 6d. (½)
- CERTAINTY (THE) OF THE FINAL JUDGMENT OF ALL MEN. A Sermon addressed principally to the Young. Second Edition. Pp. 24. 8vo. 1864. 6d. (½)
- CHRONICLE (A) OF CERTAIN EVENTS WHICH HAVE taken place in the Church of Christ, principally in England, between the years 1826 and 1852. Pp. 56. Crown 8vo. 1852. 1s. (1)
- CHURCH (THE) OF CHRIST IN ITS NATURE AND DEVELOPMENT. Translated from the German of Dr. Rossteuscher under the supervision of the Author. 8vo. Pp. 90. 1875. 1s. (1)
- DALTON'S (REV. HENRY) THE FOURFOLD MINISTRY A Permanent Gift unto the Church. Its Restoration a Sign of the Nearness of the Second Advent. With Answers to Objections. Pp. 16. 8vo. 1866. 4d. (½)
- PENTECOST. A SERMON. Pp. 16. 8vo. 1864. 6d. (½)
- WHAT IS THE CHURCH? Second Edition. Pp. 40. 8vo. 1876. (1)
- DISCOURSE (A) ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST, as revealed to the Apostle Paul, and delivered by him to the Church. (1 Cor. xi. 17-30.) Second Edition. Pp. 16. 8vo. 1876. 6d. (½)
- DISCOURSE ON THE OBLIGATION OF TITHE. DELIVERED in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Gordon Square, October 5, 1858. Pp. 24. 8vo. 1858. 8d. (½)
- DRUMMOND'S (HENRY) DISCOURSE ON THE TRUE DEFINITION of the Church, One Holy Catholic and Apostolic; and kindred Subjects. Pp. 204. 8vo. 1858. 6s. (5)

- DRUMMOND'S (H.) SUBSTANCE OF LECTURES DELIVERED
in the Churches. Pp. 374. 8vo. Cloth. 1847. 7s. 6d. (6)
- ABSTRACT PRINCIPLES OF REVEALED RE-
ligion. Second Edition. Fcap. 8vo. Pp. 350. 1876. Cloth.
3s. 6d. (3½)
- DUTY (THE) OF A CHRISTIAN IN THE DISPOSAL OF HIS
Income. A Supplement to "A Discourse on the Obligation of
Tithe." Pp. 16. 8vo. 1863. 6d. (½)
- GOD'S PURPOSE WITH MANKIND AND THE EARTH. AN
Introduction to a Right Understanding of the Scriptures of the Old
and New Testaments. Vol. I.—Old Testament. Translated from the
German of W. R. Caird and J. E. G. Lutz. Second, improved, and
enlarged Edition. 8vo. Pp. 314. 1876. Cloth. 6s. (5)
- N.B.—Vol. 2 is nearly ready.
- GROSER'S (REV. T.) SERMONS ON VARIOUS SUBJECTS,
preached in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Gordon Square.
Pp. 462. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. Cloth. 1875. 6s. (6)
- SERMONS PREACHED (FOR THE MOST PART)
in the Catholic Apostolic Church, Gordon Square. Second Series.
Crown 8vo. Pp. 460. Cloth. 6s. 1874. (6)
- THE FUNCTIONS AND CREDENTIALS OF APOS-
tles. Three Discourses. 8vo. 1872. 1s. (1)
- LETTERS TO A FRIEND CONCERNING GOD'S PRESENT
• Work for the Improvement and Blessing of His Church. By
M. A. Cantabrigiensis. Pp. 47. 12mo. 1872. 8d. (½)
- LETTER (A) ON CERTAIN STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN SOME
late Articles in the "Old Church Porch," entitled "Irvingism,"
addressed to a Minister of the Catholic Church. Pp. 74. 8vo.
1s. 6d. (1)
- NORTON'S (REV. R.) HISTORY OF THE RESTORATION OF
Apostles and Prophets. Pp. 200. Crown 8vo. 1861. Cloth.
2s. 6d. (2)
- ORDER (THE) OF THE DEACONSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN
Church: Its Place and Duties. Translated from the German.
8vo. Pp. 48. 1s. (1)
- PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE (THE) OF THE CHRISTIAN
Church. From the French of Mons. C. M. Carré. Edited by
M. N. Macdonald Hume. New Edition, revised. 8vo. Pp. 104.
1s. 6d. (2)
- PREMONITORY CRY (A); OR, A NOTE OF WARNING AND
Testimony of Hope. 8vo. Pp. 67. 1876. 1s. (1)
- READINGS UPON THE LITURGY AND OTHER DIVINE
Offices of the Church. Vol I. 3 Parts complete, with Indexes,
&c. Pp. 590. 8vo. Cloth. 8s. 6d. (9)
- Vol. II. 4 Parts. Pp. 466. 1875. 8vo. Cloth. 7s. (7½)
- READINGS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS OF THE
Church's Year. By the Author of "Apostles' Doctrine and
Fellowship." Part I.—Advent to Ascension. Crown 8vo.
Pp. 318. 1874. Cloth. 4s. 6d. (4)
- READINGS FOR THE SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS OF THE
Church's Year. Part II.—Pentecost to All Saints. Crown 8vo.
Pp. 318. 1875. Cloth. 4s. 6d. (4)
- THREE DISCOURSES ON CERTAIN SYMBOLS USED IN
Worship: being a Practical Explanation of their Meaning and
Advantage. Second Edition. Pp. 48. Crown 8vo. 1874. 8d. (½)
- WORSHIP (ON) IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH. An Exposition
of the Right Order of the Public Worship of the Church. By
W. R. Caird. Pp. 203. Fcap. 8vo. Cloth. 3s. (3)

LONDON: THOMAS BOSWORTH, 198, HIGH HOLBORN.

Carlyle, Thomas, 1803-1855.

59 Collected writings. London, T. Bosworth,
1878.

78 513p. 23cm.

1. Catholic Apostolic Church--Collected work
2. Theology--Collected works--19th century.

CCSC/mmmb

339615

